THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 110, NO. 20 NEW YORK, MONDAY, MAY 15, 1944 NUMBER 1537

Appeasing Franco Again

In regard to Franco, we seem to be back just about where we were a year ago. Franco will go on sending wolfram to Germany, an ore vitally needed to harden steel. He says, however, that he will send much less than before. He also agrees to do something about Italian ships he is holding, and to put out some of the Nazi spies in Tangier. It is understood that he again promises to remove the Spanish soldiers fighting for Hitler on the Russian front. In return, he gets the full quantity of oil and other petroleum products he was receiving from this hemisphere before we put on a partial embargo early this year.

We thus return to the open policy of appeasing a fascist who has never pretended he was not heart and soul with Hitler, a man whose word is worthless, who has made us repeated promises before and broken all of them. This time the novelty is that the American State Department says the British Foreign Office is to blame. Whoever is to blame, Hitler will continue to get badly needed war supplies, Russia will consider that she has been slapped in the face —even though she may not publicly admit it— the fascists throughout Latin America will be greatly enheartened, the protofascists in the United States will feel they have won a fine victory. All in all, a pretty grim balance sheet.

Montgomery Ward

As might have been expected, the Montgomery Ward case has been made a Roman holiday by Roosevelt-haters all over the country. Sewell Avery is being portrayed as a saintly martyr, and his long past of toryism and labor-fighting is carefully concealed. We do not know how the legal case will terminate, or whether the government presentation of it has been a good one. We do know, however, that Montgomery Ward and Company defied the authority of the War Labor Board, not once but repeatedly; that if it had succeeded, industrial relations all over the country would have been thrown into chaos; that no government in the midst of a war can afford to permit open anarchy. To pretend you can draw a line between firms that are or are not primarily in war work is nonsense. If this case should go against the government it would be the best news for Hitler in many a long day.

What Happened in Alabama

Elsewhere in this issue we comment on the victories of Senators Hill and Pepper in Alabama and Florida. An Alabama correspondent sends us some interesting news of the elections in both states, and especially in the first-named.

> It seems clear [he says] that the attempt to bring in the race issue on behalf of anti-New Deal candidates did more harm than good. It was so clumsy and so violent that it defeated its own purpose. In both states, people resented the fact that outsiders from the North were obviously trying to interfere, and were pouring in money in tremendous amounts. These reactionaries had control of a larger proportion of the press and other means of publicity than they had of the voters.
>
> Senator Hill's services to Alabama in helping to get it war plants and army bases, and his membership on two powerful Senate committees, gave him an advantage over

CONTENTS

The Week 663

Editorials

Things Are Looking Up 666
Canada and the Chinese 667

General Articles

Business and Its Doctors . . . George Soule 669
Britain's Health Services . Sir Ronald Davison 672
Russian Studies at Cornell . Ernest J. Simmons 674
Art in Wartime . . Elizabeth McCausland 676
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 680
Personnel Department . . . Manny Farber 681
The Bandwagon 681

Correspondence 682

Books in Review

A Preface to Kierkegaard . . W. H. Auden 683
"Library of the Burned Books" . . . . . Alfred Kantorowicz 686
A Reader's List 688
Crime and Punishment . . . . . E. H. 690

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1944, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a man with no national political experience. His opponent, James Simpson, hoped that Senator Hill's support of the Farm Security Administration would cost him the votes of members of the Farm Bureau Federation; but this was offset by Senator Bankhead's endorsement of Hill. An effort was made to frighten teachers and parents about Hill's support of federal aid for education: white children were stopped on the street and told to go home and say to their parents that Hill's reëlection would force them into classes with colored children. Doctors were told Hill favored socialized medicine, which was painted in the darkest and falsest colors. But neither of these campaigns worked. When Simpson supporters tried to frighten people out of their wits on the Negro question, many Alabama papers denounced him, though he gained support in the small towns and on the farms.

As the campaign went on, it became clear Simpson was the candidate of big Birmingham industrial interests, largely Northern-owned. These interests have made enormous profits from Hill's program of industrialization and power development. Yet they hate President Roosevelt so bitterly that they apparently spent close to $500,000—an unheard-of sum in Alabama primaries—to defeat Hill. As in Congress itself, Northern Republican reactionaries combined with Southern Democratic reactionaries to fight the New Deal. But it didn't work.

Exit Mr. Starnes

The voters of Alabama's Fifth Congressional District deserve the thanks of all progressives for defeating Joe Starnes, their five-time Representative, for renomination. As vice-chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Starnes was second only to Martin Dies in his persecution of labor and liberals. And through his membership on the powerful Appropriations Committee, he was able to harass and punish federal agencies or officials who did not follow the Dies line. In place of Starnes, the Fifth Alabama District has elected Albert Rains, Gadsden city attorney, who ran against Starnes as a liberal with the support of labor. War production brought large numbers of new industrial workers into Starnes's district; a large part of them became members of the CIO Rubber Workers or of other unions in Gadsden, and months ago labor went to work to encourage its members to register and pay their poll taxes. The CIO Political Action Committee was active. Many of the school teachers, powerful in Alabama politics, were angry at Starnes for casting the deciding vote in the Appropriations Committee to kill the National Youth Administration. Election Tuesday was the first day fit for ploughing that the district had had in a couple of weeks, and the farmers mostly tended to their work instead of their voting. Starnes blames his defeat on this fact.

Run-offs in two other Alabama districts still offer a chance to remove two or more anti-administration congressmen, Representative John Newsome of Birmingham and Carter Manasco of Jasper.

McMurray for Senator

The Democratic Party is doing its best to persuade Representative Howard McMurray to run for the United States Senate against the Republican incumbent, Senator Alexander Wylie. We earnestly hope Mr. McMurray decides to run, and wins. A former professor of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin, he is one of the very best men in Congress. It is interesting to know that in the recent primaries, running again for his seat in the House, McMurray, an ardent internationalist, polled more votes than the isolationist, Fred Zimmerman, who was at the top of the Dewey ticket. Senator Wylie voted right only seven times on eighteen recent crucial issues which tested a congressman's progressivism.

The Tennessee Valley v. McKellar

Washington has been startled by the tremendous public indignation that has arisen against Senator Kenneth McKellar's attempt to cripple the TVA as revenge against TVA Chairman David Lilienthal, whom the Senator hates. From all over the country have come letters and resolutions of protest, a wave of approval of the TVA which is a pleasant shock even to TVA officials themselves.

Naturally, the reaction has been sharpest among residents of the Valley. The newspapers of the area are impressed by the people's excitement, and most of the editorial columns daily denounce McKellar's actions. Community committees to fight McKellar's crippling amendments have sprung up throughout the Valley. Full-page ads are appearing in the local papers, sponsored by such varied local groups as café and beauty-shop owners, the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary or Kiwanis, the Farm Bureau Federation and the American Legion. The members of Congress are hearing the reverberations. Representatives from the Tennessee Valley are eagerly making speeches for the TVA and for the record. The responsible leadership of the House is preparing its fight against the McKellar-dominated Senate Conference Committee, with which House conferees will have a deal on the measure. It is still important to let your Representative know how you feel about the power grab Kenneth McKellar is attempting.

A Good ALP Platform

The American Labor Party of New York State, which is the state agency of the CIO Political Action Committee, has adopted a platform which ought to meet the desires of progressives everywhere. On the domestic front, the party wants (1) a representative and permanent National Planning Board to seek, under private enterprise, full production and employment, (2) a national minimum standard of living above the prewar average, (3) decent housing for every fam-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ily, (4) full health and recreation services, (5) real equality of educational opportunity, and (6) an enlarged social-security program. Internationally, it recommends (1) destruction of Axis militarism, with aid to labor organizations and democratic groups within Axis countries, (2) a genuine international organization for the preservation of peace, with a world court and sanctions against aggression, (3) a world economic organization for long-term credits to backward countries for the purpose of raising production and standards of living, to stabilize currencies, to encourage trade and to administer labor standards, (4) the right of asylum during the war for persecuted minorities, (5) firm opposition to imperialism, with the right of self-determination for colonial peoples, and (6) an adequately financed and democratically administered relief program.

This, and much else of the same tenor, defines the progressive program more concretely than any other party document we have seen. We hope the so-called "right wing" which split off to form a new liberal party will adopt as good a one, and that henceforth the two bodies will devote their entire attention to promoting the aims which they have in common and to electing the President and other candidates who can be depended upon to favor them.

School Lunches

Nine million American school children are getting a hot lunch during the school day, under supervised auspices—one-third of all the school children in the country. Of this total, more than four million benefit from the program of the Food Distribution Administration. They are not recipients of pure charity, however: most of them pay a fixed price for the lunch, though this price does not necessarily cover the entire cost.

Few people except doctors realize the importance of these free lunches. In literally millions of cases, this is the only real meal the child gets all day. For other millions, the school lunch is an unparalleled opportunity to drive home the lessons of proper diet, not only to the child but to his parents. The shockingly bad physical showing made by Americans in the draft was due not only to poverty but also to ignorance. Incidentally, the record of rejections among young men with a bad nutritional history has been 70 percent, about 30 points higher than among those who came from homes which had both the money and the knowledge to set a good table.

The work of the FDA has been costing about $50 million a year, and an economy-crazed Congress is now planning to kill the appropriation as of July 1. If it does so, it will vote for a next generation a good deal less healthy than it ought to be and can be, a generation substantially less able to protect itself in a military way.

Taking Him Too Seriously

Bolivar Pagan, Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, had himself a field day last week. He made a series of sensational charges against Governor Tugwell, suggesting in general that the Governor would probably be torn limb from limb by the outraged Islanders if he dared set foot outside any of his series of palaces, without armed bodyguards. Nearly all the American newspapers that we have seen solemnly printed this farrago of nonsense. What they failed to add is that Pagan is an inveterate enemy of Governor Tugwell, or of anybody else who tries to protect the Puerto Rican people against the big commercial interests, and that he, Pagan, lets loose a blast like this every few months with no visible results. Much of the hostility to Governor Tugwell in the American press comes from business firms which are big advertisers here, and objected to the distribution of unbranded goods in Puerto Rico as a war measure when the people were faced with starvation. Undoubtedly Governor Tugwell, like every other human being, has his faults; but it is certainly wholly to his credit that he has made an enemy of a man like Bolivar Pagan.

Inter-American Development

The first conference of the Inter-American Development Commissions which have been functioning in most of the Latin American nations during this war is now under way. Delegates from the various Latin American Commissions and from the United States are meeting in New York's Waldorf Astoria, May 9-18, to discuss questions of vital importance to our foreign trade after the war. Unfortunately, there are indications that the conference is off to a bad start. Although matters relating to agriculture and labor are included on the agenda, no representatives of these groups are included in the delegations. The United States commission is composed of: Eric Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, as chairman; Randolph Burgess, New York banker;

Little in The Nashville Tennessean

On His Shoulders . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Earl A. Emerson, Ohio industrialist; Wilson Hemingway, president of the American Bankers' Association; and Thomas McCabe, Philadelphia banker. The press is not to be admitted to any except the opening plenary session of the conference. United States Government officials responsible for conducting our economic relations with the Latin Americas are being allowed only limited participation. Nelson Rockefeller's Office of Inter-American Affairs bears major responsibility for the way in which this important meeting has been organized. He and his assistants should be made to know that we do not intend to trust our bankers, however able, and the owners of vast Latin American ranches, with the exclusive making of economic policies for this hemisphere.

Free Ports for Refugees

The United States Government talks a lot about helping refugees from Hitler-occupied Europe; but thus far, we have done almost nothing about it. We have not, for example, modified the immigration laws which make it so difficult for them to get into this country. Neither have we removed the little knot of officials in the State Department whose delight it is to put every possible obstacle in the way of these refugees. Looking realistically at this situation, Samuel Grafton of The New York Post has made an excellent suggestion. Why not, he says, set up free ports for refugees like the free ports into which goods are permitted to come without paying duty, provided they are to be reëxported? Build a few concentration camps along the Eastern seaboard. Put the refugees into them with the understanding that they are to see no more of America than this, and will be sent somewhere else when the war is over. At least, they would not then starve in Europe or use up precious cargo space for food on ships going to North Africa. If we refuse as a nation to do any more than this, then in the name of human decency, let us do no less.

Farm Security

There is little chance that the Cooley bill, giving permanent status to the Farm Security program, will be passed by the June 30 deadline unless its supporters can make a deeper impression upon their Representatives than they have yet done. The House Committee on Agriculture has completed hearings on the Cooley bill, but is expected to delay its report to the House and action on the floor. The Senate Appropriations Committee will soon act on the FSA and is considered likely to approve the request for approximately $132,500,000, unless the pressure of the Farm Bureau Federation to cut down that amount should outweigh pressure from the FSA's side. The Farm Bureau will probably follow its usual pattern and aim at cutting down the $28,500,000 the FSA is asking for administrative purposes, for the leaders know that those funds feed the heart of the program. The fight now must be to gain an adequate appropriation for next year's FSA program, and to continue to press for enactment of the Cooley bill to make permanent our gains on the farm-tenancy front.

Things Are Looking Up

IN RECENT MONTHS there has been an atmosphere of discouragement among progressives. The anti-administration majority in Congress has been doing its worst in vote after vote, applauded by the conservative press, which, after all, is now almost the whole press. Continual assertions that the rank and file of the people, like the rank and file of the soldiers, do not understand the deeper issues of the war and are becoming hostile to the administration, have been received with a good deal of credulity. The President and his advisers have on the whole appeared to be retreating before this reactionary pressure; they have compromised all along the line, on the theory that everything else must be sacrificed, if necessary, to maintain the closest possible approach to unity for the war effort.

Recent primary elections, however, indicate that all the while the rank and file of voters have held different opinions from those attributed to them. Senator Claude Pepper of Florida, under attack for too wholehearted a support of the President and the war, was renominated by a clear majority over the rest of the field, so that he does not have to contest even a run-off election. Like success attended the campaign of Senator Lister Hill of Alabama. In the same state, Representative Joe Starnes, a reactionary Democrat and member of the Dies Committee, was defeated. This spikes the argument of the anti-Roosevelt press that the election demonstrated only that the incumbents held the advantage. Progressive Republicans, criticized within their party for being too friendly to the administration, like Representative La Follette of Indiana, were renominated. There are reasons for thinking that in future primaries similar results will be achieved. Even Representative Dies is said to be in danger.

Those who consult the facts instead of their unstable emotions should not be surprised by these events. All the time, the expert testers of public opinion have been telling us that the people were far ahead of Congress, and in some cases even ahead of the President.

And, as Louis Bean demonstrated in the pages of The New Republic only two weeks ago, the Republican successes in the election of 1940 and after were derived largely from the smallness of the vote. When people are interested enough in the contest to register and vote, as in a presidential election and apparently in the recent primaries, reaction again becomes a minority.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From all this, liberals may learn a number of lessons. One is the same which took them by surprise in 1936 and 1940—never judge the temper of the people as a whole by the noise made by the conservatives. For it is obvious, as has so often been said, that the conservatives have a preponderant access to press, radio and other sounding boards of what is supposed to be "public opinion." And it is also obvious that editorial opinions and public speeches do not influence the people much, if their knowledge of the facts and their personal experience contradict the editorials.

The second lesson is one which should be taken to heart by the administration as well as by progressives in general: their strength lies not in retreat but in courageous advance. The people will be with them if they give a positive lead and if they convince the voter that elections are important enough to command effort and attention. A third lesson is that victory at the polls depends on practical political organization to get out the vote. The sentiment of the large public is almost always patriotic and liberal; it needs only to be mobilized for political action. We do not know how great a part the labor vote played in the recent primaries, but there are good reasons for thinking that the work of the CIO Political Action Committee, though still in its early stages, contributed a good deal to the results.

There are other signs in the wind which should counteract the recent mood of discouragement. Though Mr. Dewey has an isolationist past and though Mr. Willkie's campaign against him on the issues of the war and the peace seemed to be a flop, he himself is now ranging himself on the side of internationalism. Though this stand may not proceed from seasoned conviction, and though it may be deceptive as to the attitude of the ruling spirits in the Republican Party, it does indicate that the leading Republican candidate, who is at least a shrewd politician, has been advised where the predilections of the people lie. Though the isolationist roaches have recently been emboldened to begin crawling out of the woodwork again, they should not be taken too seriously. They have almost certainly miscalculated the temper of the public.

The fight is by no means over; these early successes should not give rise to an overconfidence which would be as mistaken as the previous discouragement. It would be particularly damaging if progressives should conclude that President Roosevelt's renomination and reëlection are virtually assured, and therefore nothing else needs to be done. The present Congress is a sufficient indication that a champion of progressivism in the White House does not ensure a progressive government. Organization in each state and congressional district is necessary to make sure that reaction does not continue to play fast and loose with the aspirations of the people. Both positive leadership and a hard-working political organization are required to give this country the kind of government it must have for the next four years.

In the meantime it is to be hoped that those now in Congress will be somewhat sobered by the primary results. The anti-administration forces have been riding high on the false assumption that the elements which they were echoing and which applauded them for doing so, were indeed public opinion. As a matter of fact, the reactionary movement is an eddy as far from the main current as was the Liberty League in 1936 or the Hearst-McCormick isolationists in 1940. Indeed, the Unholy Alliance in Congress has gone so far in its defiance of common sense and patriotism that it may have had a good deal to do with stimulating the pro-Roosevelt voters to come out in the primaries. Any who have gone along with it in the belief that they were climbing on a bandwagon will probably begin to fall off, since it is clear that the real parade is now marching in a different direction. Records have been made, however, and it is by those records that candidates should be judged. We have won a skirmish; now we must form our lines for the battle.

Canada and the Chinese

IN THE MAGAZINE Asia and the Americas, for February, 1944, appeared the story of an unusual experience by an American girl of Chinese racial origin, born in Hawaii. This girl, Miss Janet Jin-Ai Chong, a student at the University of Michigan, took a New York Central sleeper from New York to Ann Arbor. She was awakened in the middle of the night by a uniformed official who, according to her story, had "Canadian Immigration Officer" on his cap. In spite of her statement that she was an American citizen born in Hawaii, she was forced to dress, leave the train (it was in the Buffalo station) and take an indirect route to Ann Arbor, involving two other changes, and reaching her destination seven hours late.

In The New Republic of March 20, 1944, we repeated this little story, crediting it to Asia and the Americas, and expressed our indignation that an American citizen should be treated thus by a friendly power and ally in the war.

The item in The New Republic was noticed in the Canadian press, and questions were asked about the matter in the Canadian Parliament. Thereupon two members of the government undertook to comment. The Prime Minister, Mr. W. L. MacKenzie King, said that no Canadian immigration official had the right to take such action. Mr. T. A. Crerar, the Minister of Mines and Resources, went a good deal farther. He stated: "The lady was not asked to leave the train by any Canadian government official. . . . She was not at any time on Canadian territory. . . . Apparently no official of a Canadian railway had anything to do with the matter, any more than had any official of the Immi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gration Department." Then occurred the following dialogue:

Mr. Gordon Graydon (leader of the Opposition): In other words, no Canadian had anything to do with it at all?

Mr. Crerar: That is my understanding.

Mr. Graydon: That is fine.

Thereupon several newspapers in Canada and the United States carried articles strongly suggesting that the whole incident on the train had never taken place at all and that The New Republic had just made it up out of whole cloth.

As to this, we should like to make several comments. We begin with a sworn statement from the Chinese-American girl in question. Says Miss Chong:

AFFIDAVIT

State of Michigan, } ss.:
Washtenaw County }

Before me this 13th day of April, 1944, appears Miss Janet Jin-Ai Chong, who deposes and says:

(1) That she is the author of the article "Sorry, But You're Chinese," in the February, 1944, issue of the magazine Asia and the Americas, and that this article is true in all respects.

(2) That she was awakened in a train en route between New York City and Ann Arbor, Michigan, in the railway station at Buffalo at 2:50 a. m., on June 28, 1943, by a uniformed official who led her to believe by his words, uniform and conduct that he was a Canadian Immigration officer; that this officer told her that "Chinese citizens are not allowed to pass through Canada," and that she would have to get up, dress, leave the train, and take some other train to her destination which did not pass over Canadian soil; that she told this officer that she is an American citizen, born in Hawaii, and gave him her Certificate of Identification; that in spite of this fact, he forced her to leave the train; and that she was obliged to take another train changing at Toledo and Detroit, and arriving seven hours late.

Signed: JANET JIN-AI CHONG

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 13th day of April, 1944. My commission expires January 23, 1948.

M. ROBERT B. KLINGER, Notary Public
in and for Washtenaw County, Michigan

(Seal)

The debate in the Canadian Parliament, and the newspaper articles which were sent out, deliberately evaded the whole central point at issue. In spite of the pretense to the contrary, Canada has a law, in existence for many years, forbidding Chinese to enter its borders. The exceptions are the same as those which until recently were part of the United States laws: diplomats, business men on business missions, students, etc. These restrictions refer to persons of Chinese race, regardless of nationality. In theory, such a person might be able to obtain diplomatic permission to cross Canada on the way between two points in another country or between two countries; but obtaining such permission would involve elaborate correspondence, would certainly take weeks, and the effort might fail in the end.

A young Chinese-American girl, engaged to a person of Chinese race, an officer in the Canadian army, tried to buy a ticket on the New York Central Railroad to go to Toronto to visit her fiancé. She was refused a ticket, though she was told she might apply to Ottawa for permission and then get one. Since she was warned that such papers would take several weeks at best, and since her fiancé had only a short leave, she abandoned the project. The New York Central has a standing rule not to sell tickets into Canada to persons of Chinese race. Undoubtedly other railroads have the same rule.

One case which has come to our attention is that of a group of American soldiers stationed on the United States-Canadian border near a Canadian town. One night a party of them, including one American of Chinese descent, attempted to cross the border for an evening's entertainment in the Canadian town. All the others were told they could go on, but the Chinese American was told he was under arrest. When the whole party offered to turn back into the United States, the Canadian border official said that, on the contrary, the Chinese American would have to wait and be deported. He was held for several hours and then set free to return to the United States.

It is certainly conceivable that Miss Chong was mistaken about the lettering on the cap of the official who awakened her. But it is astonishing for the Canadian Prime Minister and Mr. Crerar to pretend that whoever put her off the train was acting on an idle whim of his own. If it was an American railway official, he was acting in response to a Canadian law, trying to avoid the severe fine to which the railway would be subjected if it carried a person of Chinese descent into Canada. We believe public-spirited citizens of Canada will agree with us that it is shocking that American citizens in transit between two points in the United States—or for that matter, anybody else—should be awakened in the middle of the night and put off a train, in response to a Canadian law. We think that law ought to be changed.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, THOMAS SANCTON, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Business and Its Doctors

SCIENCE has accumulated enough prestige so that the more intelligent people now go to doctors when they want to know how to get well or stay so. But by an unfortunate series of events, the science of economics has not gained equal authority among those who are responsible for the health of the institutions by which we are supposed to make our livings. Business men and legislators scoff at the professors and the theorists while they continue to doctor themselves and buy gallons of advertising liniment or dozens of Private Enterprise Pink Pep Pills.

No doubt economists themselves are largely to blame, yet in recent years there has been an increasing contingent of the profession who take their science and their social obligations seriously and have at least some informed advice to offer. Two prominent representatives have recently written out their prescriptions for anyone who will pay attention. One is a relatively young but well trained practitioner who is in general agreement with the school most closely associated with the present administration. The other is an older and more experienced analyst who adopts a somewhat different view. Their books do not make exciting reading, but deserve careful attention because they are devoted to subjects which are of critical importance. How, if at all, is private enterprise to be preserved? How can we have full employment and an economy of abundance after the war? If I were dictator, I should sentence all business spokesmen to stop talking about these subjects until they had read, digested and either accepted or rejected with good reason the theses of these two books.

The Fiscal-Policy Prescription. – This doctrine, associated mainly with Lord Keynes in Britain and Alvin H. Hansen in the United States, is explained, as far as it can be explained in non-technical language, by Robert R. Nathan in "Mobilizing for Abundance."[1] Mr. Nathan, before his entrance into the army, was chairman of the Planning Committee of the War Production Board. He had held various other economic posts with the government, and had received his education at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce.

Mr. Nathan believes in private enterprise if it can be made to work. He doesn't think it works as long as we are in danger of depressions like that of the thirties when, with the manpower, equipment and resources which lay idle, "we could have much more than rebuilt every factory, every office building, every bridge, every railroad, every dam, every power plant, every piece of furniture and clothing, and all other reproduceable assets which exist in the United States today." We need not repeat that experience, since the war economy has proved that we can have full employment. In spite of producing for war in 1943 as many goods as we ever produced for peace, the nation also turned out for civilian consumption more than we all consumed in 1939. That shows that if we put our minds to it, we can have plenty for everybody.

What makes the difference between 1932 and 1943? Long and complicated books would be required to detail all the differences, but the essence is simple. Income is derived from the production and sale of goods and services. If that income is spent for new goods and services, production will continue in the same volume. If still more is spent—the extra money being derived from expansion of credit, for instance—production will increase. But if not all the money that is received is spent, then production will decrease. How many goods we make, and how many jobs there are, depend on how much is spent. The difference, then, between war prosperity and the former depression is at bottom only that now the government is spending a lot of money, whereas in 1929 people stopped spending as much as they were receiving. Income in turn started to decline along with the consequent drop in production.

How does it ever happen that money received is not spent? This is the point at which we must follow the reasoning carefully in order to understand the theory. It is not a difficult theory to understand, and yet not one in a thousand who talks about it seems to understand it. If we showed as little mental flexibility in understanding the principles of the gasoline motor, we should still be riding behind horses.

Millions of individuals and business concerns habitually save money. That is just another way of saying that they do not spend it for current consumption. This, then, is the place where spending first halts. But if savings are not immediately spent by the savers, they may be spent by others. The savings bank may lend your money on mortgage to someone who uses it to build a new house. The insurance company may buy bonds from a railroad which uses the money to lay new tracks. The corporation in which you buy stock may spend the money to enlarge its business. Economists used to think that all this took place automatically, so that all the money saved was eventually spent by somebody. But the new school thinks that is all nonsense. The decisions to use borrowed savings are independent ones, not based on the amount of savings there are, but on a lot of other things. People go ahead saving out of habit. But speculators build houses, or railroads lay tracks, or businesses expand, by fits and starts, according to the chance of profit they see.

[1] Mobilizing for Abundance, by Robert R. Nathan. New York: Whittlesey House. 228 pages. $2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus you have, on the one hand, a saving habit, which takes a certain percentage out of the circulating purchasing power with a fair amount of regularity, and on the other hand, decisions to return that money to circulation by what Mr. Nathan calls "offsets to savings," which sometimes are smaller than the total saved. When offsets to savings are not large enough, gas stops flowing to the economic motor, and it starts to stall. Income drops, new savings drop, offsets to savings drop still more, and pretty soon we find that the money we thought we had saved has disappeared.

Mr. Nathan assumes that after the war we shall, if unemployment is reduced to a minimum, be able to turn out a national product worth $150 billion a year, at present prices. That is a very conservative estimate; many would place it higher. If we save out of this as much as we did on the average before the war, or 20 percent, we shall lay aside $30 billion. Therefore offsets to savings must be at least $30 billion if depression is to be avoided. They have never been anywhere near so large as that in the past. During the prosperous twenties, private enterprise did not manage to invest more than $10 billion a year in new housing, plant and equipment of all kinds, and even that resulted in eventual "overequipment" in relation to the effective demand for goods.

Where are the other twenty billion dollars to be spent, in order to keep us rolling? Mr. Nathan and others concerned with this problem do not believe, after going over the available figures, that all this money will be invested, if we just leave it to chance and private enterprise. They may be wrong; they would be delighted if they were. But no spokesman for private enterprise has been able to produce any figures to prove them wrong; indeed, most do not see the problem at all. It is well to be prepared for the chance that Mr. Nathan is right.

Anyone who supposes that the prescription of the economists to guard against this danger is a lot of reckless borrowing and spending by government, resulting in a permanently unbalanced budget and a continual growth of the national debt, is ignorant of what they think. They want, first of all, to set the scene for larger investment by private industry and for higher consumption of industrial products by the people. Much can be done to bridge the gap within the realm of private enterprise if, on the one hand, industry can be encouraged to expand faster, and on the other, consumers can be induced to spend more and save less.

In order to do this it would be helpful to remove the restrictions on output in the construction industry, and get it on a basis where it can produce more and better houses more cheaply. It would be helpful to remove monopoly restrictions and monopoly prices wherever they exist. A most important measure would be reform of the taxation system so that it would bear less heavily on those who customarily spend most of what they earn, and more heavily on those who do most of the saving—that is, those in the middle and upper income brackets. This can be done by repealing sales and other indirect taxes which are passed on to the consumer, and relying more on progressive income taxes. Broadening the social-security system is another potent means of increasing consumers' spending, since if the future is provided for by a means which does not require so much saving in the present, people will be less afraid to buy what they want. Easing the way for foreign trade and investment would help. A large reserve of useful public works for emergencies would provide the final resort. This need not be financed by borrowing except when heroic measures are necessary. It may be paid for out of taxes, designed to draw forth money which would otherwise have been saved, but not invested.

The Low-Price Prescription. – The other book, "Price-Making in a Democracy,"[1] by Edwin G. Nourse, consists of advice to business on how it should run its own affairs, by a former president of the American Economic Association, a vice-president of the Brookings Institution. It attacks the same great problems which concern Mr. Nathan, but approaches them at quite a different point. Essentially, it does not ask what we can do to compensate for the failure of the business order to achieve full production and high employment, but why the business order does fail to produce fully, and what business can do about it.

Mr. Nathan, we have seen, is concerned with the amount of money people spend. Mr. Nourse is concerned with the prices they pay. Obviously there are two ways to increase the purchasing power of the consumer and hence the amount of production and employment. One is to see that he spends more dollars; the other is to see that the dollars he spends buy more goods. The latter depends on the prices he is charged, and it is the process of price-setting by private enterprise which Mr. Nourse examines.

Again we have to deal with a rather intricate theory which requires close attention to follow in all its details, but which anyone can understand in its major essentials. Modern industry is characterized by rapid technical advance. Let us say that an important technical improvement occurs in a given industry, so that goods may be produced with less labor. Suppose the employer fails to lower prices. He then sells the same amount as before, and gets as much money for it. He discharges the labor which now has become unnecessary, and saves expense. Thus his profit is increased. Some of this profit he spends for consumers' goods, some is reinvested in additional productive capacity. The spending of the profit employs labor, to offset the unemployment occasioned by the adoption of the new

[1] Price-Making in a Democracy, by Edwin G. Nourse. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution. 551 pages. $3.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

process. At this point in the analysis the older economists used to stop; it seemed to them that everything was automatically adjusted, just as they supposed that all savings were automatically invested.

But who is to purchase the product of the new equipment, bought with the enlarged profit? The employer, plus other employers who are pursuing the same course? Hardly, because their wants do not run entirely to industrial output such as shoes, clothing, automobiles and the like. Besides, they keep saving and reinvesting a large part of the extra profits they make. Meanwhile the purchasing power of labor and other non-employer consumers does not increase. The result is that before long there is developed that very "over-equipment" to produce which, as Mr. Nathan has noted, limits new investment.

Suppose the employer who installs the better process and does not lower prices uses the money gain, not to increase profits, but to raise the wages of those who retain their jobs. That is a somewhat better course, but it will not maintain full employment. It is likely to result in at least some increase in saving as compared with spending, because people with higher wages save more. As a matter of fact, it seldom happens anyway, because wages tend always to become equalized throughout an industry or a region, and are held down by the less efficient concerns, who cannot match such increases and stay in business.

What is necessary, thinks Mr. Nourse, is that the employer should lower his price. What happens then, in the ideal case? Suppose he lowers his price enough to absorb the entire saving in cost. He can probably sell much more at the lower price. His profit increases, not because of any wider profit margin per unit, but because of larger volume. He may not have to discharge anybody; indeed, he may need more labor than before. And when he invests part of the profit in new equipment, there will be a market for what it can produce, if other employers do the same.

Mr. Nourse points out that this is what the classical economists who first provided the justification for private enterprise thought would happen inevitably. They expected it to happen because of competition; if there is enough competition, prices will always be forced down pretty near the level of costs. But in large areas of business today competition does not set prices; prices are fixed by executive decision, as well as by many institutional arrangements.

There is nothing new about the argument for reduction of prices. Why is not the practice more consistently followed by business? Mr. Nourse examines that question in considerable detail, and discovers that even if the theory were well understood, many individual executives are not in a position to follow it. They are uncertain how much their markets would be increased by lower prices, especially in view of the fact that they cannot count on industry generally to follow the same policy. What is obviously good for the economy as a whole may offer no immediate benefit to any one part of it. What Mr. Nourse wants to convey to business is that in the long run and on the whole it would be better off on the low-price, large-volume formula. He hopes business will organize itself in such a way that it can act accordingly. He visualizes, instead of monopoly and quasi-monopoly, combinations to *promote* trade by low prices and full employment. It cannot be done without organization for nationwide planning, and there is doubt whether such planning would be put into effect without governmental participation.

What It All Comes To.—Neither Mr. Nathan nor Mr. Nourse has presented ideas entirely original with himself, which might be regarded as interesting but perhaps negligible vagaries of economic theory. Both are dealing with material familiar to large bodies of the profession, and substantiated by many accumulations of statistics and much careful analysis. Though they might not agree with each other on specific remedies, there is nothing mutually inconsistent in their picture of the situation. They agree (1) that the private enterprise of today is not the same thing which the economists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries described when they advocated laissez-faire, (2) that left to itself it will not produce abundance and will run into depressions and unemployment, (3) that if this happens again after the war, the system of free enterprise is likely to be swept away, (4) that in order to save free enterprise, government must intervene, by fiscal policy or by encouragement of low prices, as well as in other ways.

It used to be thought, and is still often said by apologists for business, that planning and free enterprise are opposites, that the more business is planned, and especially the more it is planned on a national scale with the participation of government, the less free it will be. But here are sober economists saying that if free enterprise is to be saved from disaster, business must plan, and must not only tolerate but demand certain types of governmental intervention. Mr. Nathan suggests the type of intervention which curbs monopoly, redistributes income through taxation policy and social security and fills in the savings-investment gap by governmental spending. Mr. Nourse wants business so to manage its own pricing policies that Mr. Nathan's type of intervention may be reduced to a minimum, but he implies that it is not likely to have much success in doing so without governmental help. Business has now what may prove to be a last chance to listen to its doctors. Will it achieve full production and full employment? Or will it go on grabbing for power and profits while the grabbing is good, on the theory that any who issue warnings or advice are either subversive enemies, or impractical theorists "who never had to meet a payroll"? GEORGE SOULE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain's Health Services

WINSTON CHURCHILL has two vast wars on his hands, but he recently unfurled the flag of another great campaign on the home front—a campaign against disease and on behalf of health for the people.

His Majesty's Government [he said] have embarked on a very large-scale plan. Our policy is to create a National Health Service which will ensure that everybody in this country, irrespective of their means, age, sex or occupation, shall have equal opportunities to benefit from the best and most up-to-date medical and allied services available. The new discoveries of healing science, fanned by the fierce wings of war, must in future be the inheritance of all. Disease must be attacked, whether it occurs in the poorest or richest man or woman, simply because it is the enemy.

Up to the latter half of the nineteenth century our medical services were private only; many of them were charities. The only exception was that, under the Poor Laws, each local "parish" had to provide for sick persons who were destitute. For the rest there was the ordinary general practitioner, familiarly known as the GP. The GP was the pivot of the system, and for that matter he always will be.

Behind the GP is the voluntary hospital, endowed and supported by private funds. There are more than 1,000 voluntary hospitals in Britain, treating upwards of 6,000,000 patients a year. They are not all equally good and they are seldom free from financial problems, but they occupy a great place in the nation's life, and what is more, they control all the ordinary medical schools and the greater part of Britain's medical research. It is by them that we have lately been endowed with the M and B and penicillin.

But there are not nearly enough of them for our modern industrial age. They have therefore had to be supplemented by public hospitals, built by local government authorities or taken over from the old "Poor Law Guardians." Today nearly three-quarters of the total hospitalization of our people is furnished by these public institutions, including all infectious-disease cases and most of the provision for maternity. They are paid for out of local taxes, aided by grants from the central government.

The great development of our public health services dates from the year 1906. Local authorities are now responsible for all maternity and child welfare. They train and supply certificated midwives at a low cost or, if necessary, without fee. On the same terms as to payment, they enable an ever growing proportion of mothers to have their babies in maternity hospitals, a great improvement. There is, of course, a scale of medical charges, but in all cases of proved poverty, the doctor's fees can be paid by the Authority. During the mother's incapacity, a "home help" can be supplied to look after the family. There are, in most towns, maternity and child-welfare clinics, day nurseries for infants and nursery schools for children under five. The giving of food and milk to mothers and infants free or below cost price is now very generally practised.

The local Education Authority takes over the care of the growing child at five years of age; there is medical inspection and treatment by part-time school doctors. Since 1910 we have also found a place here for the voluntary social worker. Much remains to be done, particularly in dental care, but there has been a sensational improvement in child health and in the height and weight of children in the last 30 years. Housing is the trouble; wartime evacuation of boys and girls to the country away from congested districts and bombs has proved what could and should be done.

I now pass to National Health Insurance, which began in the year 1911. Today our population of working age, earning up to $130 a month, has been compulsorily insured against sickness and the loss of wages due thereto. They and their employers pay a flat rate of contributions and draw a flat rate of benefit after the fourth day of certified sickness. It is only about $15 a month for a man, and there is nothing for his dependents, but many people draw a somewhat higher rate by joining an Approved (Insurance) Society. For treatment, there is a panel of GP's, and most doctors are empaneled. Free medical treatment and medicine are guaranteed within the limits of a general-practitioner service, but surgical and hospital services are not included.

There is not the slightest doubt that this great scheme has been an inestimable boon to our people during the last 30 years. Many millions of sick workers would, without it, have no medical attention at all. It now covers some 20,000,000 people, but it provides no service of any kind for the other 25,000,000, including the 9,000,000 mothers, their children, the small employers, the self-employed and the non-earners.

The system of panel doctoring is fairly good so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. It is limited and patchy; it is unrelated to our hospitals and the local public health services. We could do a lot better. When you in the United States come to formulate your plan of sickness compensation and insurance, you can learn much from our mistakes. For one thing, you will emphasize, I feel sure, the preventive side more than we have done, making it a real scheme for insuring *health* rather than curing sickness.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But we also have learned our lesson, and I come now to our plans for the future to which Mr. Churchill was referring. Following Sir William Beveridge's advice, we are proposing to take the medical service clean out of social insurance, leaving only the provision of cash benefits within the compulsory-contributor system. A real National Health Service is to be created by our Minister of Health and our local authorities by building on both public and private foundations.

The proposal is that all citizens should in future have free access to a full range of health care from birth to death, if they care to use it. No one will be compelled to use it (at least not at first; but I should not be surprised if these words have to be modified some day in the public interest), and both doctors and patients can, if they prefer, remain outside the free national scheme and make their own private contracts with one another on the old "commercial" basis.

Those who use the new service (that means, in my estimate, 95 percent of the population) will get without charge the care of a family doctor of their choice, the skill of a consultant when needed, treatment in hospital or clinic, dental and ophthalmic care, drugs and appliances, midwifery and home nursing. And all these branches of medical service are to be planned and correlated with one another by the Ministry of Health for England and Wales. Scotland has made slight variations on the English plan.

Broadly speaking, the present pattern of British local government will be retained and developed. Some 40 or 50 Joint Health Boards will be set up, each composed of elected representatives from the existing local authorities in the region of the joint board. Each board will submit to the Minister of Health a complete plan for a full health service in its region.

These plans, particularly the hospital schemes, will be supervised, inspected and coördinated by the Minister and his regional staff. Most of the existing local services (for mothers and children, the tuberculous and so on) will have to be expanded and we shall probably need a good many more hospitals, more better-trained consultants and certainly a great many more qualified GP's. As for dentistry and the care of the eyes, it will take years to build up the required personnel.

The medical world is full of sensitive spots; I expect it is the same in America. Two of them are the "standoffishness" of our voluntary hospitals and the demand of our GP's for a status of independence and freedom. A really admirable attempt to meet these professional demands has been made in the White Paper in which the Minister sets out his new proposals. Without sacrificing any of the great objectives of the National Plan, he offers the hospitals a compromise which may secure their private status and he assures the GP's against the dangers of control by local politicians.

To the voluntary hospitals he says: "You can participate as autonomous contracting agencies. If you perform the services for which you contract under the plan, you will receive various payments from both central and local taxes." That means, however, that they will still have to raise a good many million dollars to meet their capital and maintenance liabilities. Can they do it? Will the public still support them? I do not know, but I think the offer is a fair one. They cannot expect to be financed 100 percent by the taxpayers without also being controlled 100 percent.

As for that good man, the ordinary family doctor, he is often enough enthusiastic for the proposed reforms, but as a class, represented by his "trade union" (*i. e.*, the British Medical Association), he is extending the plan no more than a cautious welcome.

There were long negotiations before the White Paper was drafted and there will be many more. The BMA has already stood out for the "free choice of doctor" and against a universal salaried system. This has been conceded, together with the important principle that the doctors shall be employed, not by the local joint boards, but by a Central Medical Board, largely professional and ensconced in the Ministry of Health. All the terms of the doctors' participation will be centrally negotiated and much of the actual administration will be the function of the Central Medical Boards—one for England and Wales and one for Scotland. It will be vital to obtain the best possible distribution of GP's and the CMB will have power to deal with overdoctored districts by refusing permission to start up a public practice there or even to take over an existing public practice.

As to remuneration there will be two different kinds of local practice—separate and grouped. A doctor working by himself will have his own list of "public" patients who have registered with him. It will resemble the present panel system, and the doctor will receive per-capita fees for his whole panel. This might bring him in anything between $5,000 and $10,000 a year; it will be the predominant system for some years to come. But, in future, every encouragement is to be given to grouped practices of, say, five or even ten doctors working together. The local health center is the fullest expression of this idea and such centers are in due course to be planned by the joint boards and publicly provided as part of the local service. All diagnostic apparatus and other equipment will be found and each doctor joining the center will have his own consulting room and other services without any charge to him. Obviously, in such a case, remuneration can only be on a salaried basis.

Doctors, even if they are in the public service, still want to be free to engage in private practice among any patients who prefer this. Some doctors, and especially consultants, may elect to remain entirely "private." If so, there will be nothing to stop them. But, where a doctor undertakes private in addition to public practice, the number of patients he will be permitted

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to take under the National Service—and consequently his pay—will be adjusted downwards. Young doctors entering the public scheme will normally be required to service for a year or two as assistants to more experienced men (or women) practitioners.

What, you may ask, has been the reaction of the people of Britain to all this? I think I can safely say that, so far as they understand it at present, they like it well, especially the wage-earning masses. They have, indeed, been waiting for the scheme ever since Sir William Beveridge proclaimed in his report that an all-in medical service for the nation was one of his assumptions for the future.

A debate on the White Paper has now been held in Parliament. It has cleared the air and defined the general attitude of political and professional groups. The plan, well considered as it is, has however been put forward only tentatively by the Minister of Health on behalf of the government. Constructive criticism is awaited and invited, and only when all sides have been heard will legislation be introduced. That will be our democratic way not only with this great plan, but also with the Beveridge scheme of social insurance and other measures of postwar reconstruction.

SIR RONALD DAVISON

London

Russian Studies at Cornell

LAST SUMMER Cornell University offered a highly successful educational program that consisted of intensive courses in the Russian language and an intensive Study of Contemporary Russian Civilization. The New York World-Telegram, without making any attempt to send a representative to listen to the lectures or to interview the students and instructors, saw fit to attack this program as "communistic." Cornell proposes to repeat the courses this summer. In anticipation of renewed Red-baiting attacks, it may be of interest to describe this program of study and to explain the educational aims that inspired it.

About two years ago, the American Council of Learned Societies sponsored at several institutions a series of intensive language courses in the more remote tongues. The immediate purpose was twofold: to develop new materials and techniques in language training, and to prepare in as short a time as possible students who would be competent to use these languages in the war effort. The results have been most satisfactory.

Under this program, courses in the intensive study of Russian were set up at Cornell (twelve of these intensive language courses have already been taught). For six months students devote themselves entirely to the study of Russian. There are ten hours of classroom work a week, and five hours of individual conversational drill with native informants or tutors. The essential principle behind this training is simple: a foreign tongue should be learned as one's native language is first learned—by hearing it spoken.

Of course there is much more to the method than this. Grammar is not neglected, nor are reading and writing. The classes must be kept small for the best results, and some linguistic aptitude is essential. Special techniques and materials have been worked out, and unquestionably the intensive nature of the study has contributed to the success with which the language soon becomes an active part of the student's thought processes. The avowed aim is to provide the student, in a relatively short time, with a foreign language that he can use as an efficient, practical tool.

To supplement this intensive Russian-language study, Cornell also introduced, with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation, an intensive comprehensive and integrated study of the contemporary civilization of Russia. Over the last few years there has been a growing interest in our universities in the educational possibilities of civilization studies, but the experiments have been mostly concerned with American civilization, and the emphasis has rarely been placed on the contemporary scene.

Cornell selected Soviet Russia for its initial experiment because public opinion is badly informed on this country, and because of the belief that the study of Russia ought to become a definite part of American educational experience. Over the last twenty-five years our colleges and universities have sadly neglected formal education on Soviet Russia. Before the war fewer than a dozen institutions offered courses in the Russian language, literature and history, and very rarely were such efforts concerned with developments after the 1917 Revolution. Courses in the social sciences devoted almost no solid instruction to Soviet Russia, and graduate students considered such a concentration a professional liability. The unfortunate result today is a shocking lack of properly trained teachers in the Russian field, which, under the impact of the war, is coming to be regarded as of the utmost importance.

After careful consideration, a curriculum was planned for this second Cornell experiment that would provide a comprehensive and integrated study of the important aspects of contemporary Russian civilization. Six courses were taught, including Russian History, Soviet Government and International Relations, Economics, Social Institutions and Life, and Soviet Literature. The sixth course consisted of thirteen weekly workshop seminars on various specialized phases of contemporary Russian civilization, such as the Rus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sian People, Soviet Education, Medicine and Health, Scientific Achievements, Agriculture, Industrial Development, Military and Naval History, Jurisprudence, Music, Theatre and Cinema, and Art and Architecture.

The staff was made up of nineteen instructors, who were selected on the basis of distinction, achieved either through academic experience or published works or both. Special qualifications were demanded of the students, who took all six courses, which ran for a full college semester of sixteen weeks.

Although substantial study of the development of Russian civilization before the 1917 Revolution was required in all the courses, the emphasis was definitely placed on the period after 1917. A consistent attempt was made to teach in an integrated manner the various stages of Soviet development. For example, in treating the first Five-Year Plan, the students studied at the same time in the several courses the historical, political, economic, social and literary aspects of this period. Integral and vital supplements to the curriculum were an extensive program of Soviet films and photographic exhibits that were keyed to the subjects in the courses that they were intended to illustrate.

It would take more space than is available to discuss in detail the organization of this program, the educational techniques developed, the course outlines, examinations and special bibliographies.[1] From the outset the students reacted favorably. They soon began to assume an intellectual responsibility for the material taught them, and were in no sense merely passive receptacles of knowledge. After an initial dose of theory and speculation, they manifested an increasing interest in facts, and then in the interpretation of these facts, which they questioned at every turn. After a factual foundation was laid, the instructors soon learned that in controversial matters any form of special pleading was resented and quickly criticized by the students. On the other hand, it was interesting to observe in this study of a subject so suspect among Americans in general, that in the orderly process of classroom instruction the psychological element of fear of the Soviet Union in many of these students quickly disappeared. In brief, education, by overcoming ignorance, destroyed fear and prepared the way for an objective and rational understanding of the civilization of Soviet Russia.

Two fundamental factors contributed most to the educational effectiveness of this Intensive Study of Contemporary Russian Civilization: the intensive nature of the study, and the attempt to present, through the medium of a group of integrated courses, a comprehensive understanding of a modern civilization. The war emergency has centered attention on the educational benefits to be obtained from an intensive application to the study of well defined subjects. There can be little doubt that the leisurely practice in our colleges of extending the study of several unrelated subjects over a protracted period is wasteful of time and educationally unfruitful. Certainly, in the program under discussion, there can be no doubt that the intensive method applied to a single broad subject created an ideal educational atmosphere among students and staff.

The second fundamental aspect—a comprehensive and integrated knowledge of the contemporary civilization of a country—has unquestionably proved itself, on the basis of this experiment, to be an educationally sound program and one that possesses real advantages over the present general system of majoring in college studies. And it may be added that the positive data obtained from these experiments are supported by what we now know of the success of the somewhat similar efforts of the Army Specialized Training program in area and language courses.

The question naturally arises whether these proved methods can be given wider application in liberal-arts colleges in the study of other languages and civilizations, such as German, French, Chinese, etc. The answer would seem to be in the affirmative, although it must be frankly admitted that such application would mean the establishment of a radically changed approach to language instruction, and the formulation of a whole new series of major fields of study. Such a changed approach, of course, would require a significant alteration in the departmental stratification in our colleges, so that the present restricted frontiers of knowledge could be freely crossed into broader studies of modern civilizations.

There is no suggestion that the program described provides a complete liberal education as we now understand it. The present electives and major fields of concentration need not be interfered with by the introduction of foreign-civilization studies, although some adjustments of the regular curricula of liberal-arts colleges would be required. The complete programs might well resemble that described in the case of Russian, with the addition of certain related courses. Every effort should be made to have the student study his foreign language intensively in his first or second year. He would then be able to make effective use of the language in his future courses in the appropriate field of civilization. The minimum requirement of such a major field ought to be the six courses that were offered in the Intensive Study of Contemporary Russian Civilization. And any one of these, especially the orientation course on the country's social institutions and life, would be an excellent course for non-majors to take for general information about a foreign country.

This type of international education will help to revitalize the liberal arts, and will infuse into them that increment of reality, which has been lacking in a system that has failed in a large measure to adjust itself fully to the educational needs of our modern civilization. More than this, such education will be an emphatic step in the direction of international understanding and coöperation.

ERNEST J. SIMMONS

[1] A complete educational report on the Cornell Intensive Study of Contemporary Russian Civilization has been prepared.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Art in Wartime[1]

WAR DID NOT TAKE the artists and art institutions of the United States by surprise. Scarcely had the shock of Pearl Harbor faded when air-raid sirens shrilled over New York, and in museums, as elsewhere, citizens hurried to already prepared shelters. A few days after the declaration of war, American museum directors in emergency session stated that museum functions would be maintained. Art treasures were soon moved inland for safe keeping. Eager, too, were America's artists to participate, offering their services to the country and calling for rapid mobilization of their skills for propaganda and record. War did not come as a surprise—since we had lived with war since 1939.

Nevertheless art in America during the past five years has been oddly unchanged by crisis. Plans for the custody of works of art were evolved in line with the practice of European countries, closer to invasion than ourselves. To use art to educate and arouse our people is a logical application of the experience of the United Nations, from China's pioneer "pen and brush guerrillas" to the familiar programs of Great Britain and the Soviet Union. There was, however, a theoretical or abstract quality to these preparations: our shores had not been invaded; bombs had not rained on our land; our fighting men were not yet involved in combat. The order of the day for art was to follow old directions and old habits of thought.

A long-range view of art in the United States shows that the past five years' developments have evolved along characteristic lines, organic in American history. The use of art and the place of art in American life have never been simple, mechanically isolated phenomena but rather the expression of complex social factors. Thus, when we say that art in wartime mirrors contemporary social flux, we must look back for the source of these tides. The picture is one of contradictions.

Against the fact that the art market has not dwindled appreciably may be set government's failure to use art in the war. The issue of private v. public patronage is, therefore, posed again after a decade when, the private patron having failed, government assumed the function of patronage. On another horizon, the limited public use of art for propaganda and record may be contrasted with the rise of labor as a new patron. Then, the Americanism induced by war has swept through museums to dispel the nation's three-century-long cultural inferiority complex. As history accelerates, Americans begin to *see* their past and are proud. Opposed, however, to the continuing rediscovery of America is an esthetic conflict exaggerated by the influx of many foreign artists, refugees from fascism. "The great flight of culture," as Fortune terms it, intensifies stress and strain.

Further, there is the tension which exists between New York as world art capital and the growing decentralization of art in the United States. In providing cultural and recreational programs for the armed services, the nation's museums have broken away from provincialism. At the same time, New York possesses even greater intellectual prestige as a refuge for Europe's art and artists. One might say that artistic Paris—that part which is not collaborating with the Nazis—has moved to New York. Growing Americanism in art, renewed École de Paris pressure—this cleavage in theory wins a national audience. The increasing vogue of circulating exhibitions begun by the College Art Association and the American Federation of Art, expanded a dozen years ago by the Museum of Modern Art, and now taken up by institutions like the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Art Institute of Chicago and the National Gallery, cuts a channel to disseminate "New York" esthetics throughout the country. Contrariwise, the United States has moved into New York, port of embarkation that it is, and the "country boy" who visits the metropolis' museums has a new idea of the culture of cities. Thus forces interact.

A study of what has happened since 1939 in museums, galleries, artists' groups and union halls shows that art in wartime cannot be divorced from prewar experience. In the twenties, material support followed the traditional channels of private patronage. In the thirties, to offset waning private patronage, government programs came into being, creating new social relations in public patronage. Government support, however, was soon cut off and the WPA art project was finally liquidated in the fall of 1942. Reactionary forces in American society deserve credit for the enforced withdrawal of government as patron.

The graph of oscillation between public and private patronage can also be drawn in the war years. Crisis was slowly reflected in cultural institutions: schedules of exhibitions, publications and educational programs continued unchanged, while esthetic policy remained as it had been—art has nothing to do with politics. Perhaps the first sign of change is the Museum of Modern Art's statement in regard to "Britain at War": "Those whose work is shown here have fought well without guns." After December 7, 1941, museums espoused social functions, setting up recreation centers, donating space to the Red Cross and exhibiting work to arouse public opinion in support of the war. Foremost among

[1] This is the ninth of a series of articles on American civilization in wartime. – THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exhibitions with a diplomatic purpose have been those of Latin American art.

In the spring and summer of 1941, artists' groups had already begun to call for government use of art in the war effort. The WPA, not then demolished, offered an organization ready to hand, New York's poster division, for example, making many defense designs. The formation immediately after Pearl Harbor of Artists for Victory—a council of 30 national artists' organizations with 10,000 practising artists as members throughout the nation—is proof that our artists were prepared to serve the country "well without guns." The slowness of this artists' spokesman to establish relations with the government agencies which use visual material must be laid at the feet of a Congress that kills food subsidies, drafts tax bills inadequate to the nation's financial needs and robs soldiers of the vote.

Art's economic structure may be reduced to characteristic institutions of museum, art dealer and collector—in total, "private patronage." Museums, whether supported by public or private funds, are private in essence, being subject to no checks save somewhat veiled annual reports. Thus, in considering the material effect of war on art, one must make assumptions as to the amount of money available for the support of living art. Certain indices may, however, be noted, such as museum annual expenditures, purchase funds, auction-sale totals. The unexpected situation is that museums not only fail to show marked decreases in funds but, on the contrary, present a picture of increased attendance and expanded program, despite serious losses of personnel. Further, annual totals from leading auction firms in New York City—still the nation's art trading center—have increased till the money that is being spent in wartime for *objets d'art* has almost reached the high of boom year 1928-29.

The annual reports of the three-quarters-of-a-century-old Metropolitan Museum of Art are significant. With an endowment of almost $40,000,000, the museum is restricted to spending 30 percent of its endowment income for works of art, a sum of about $500,000 a year. From 1939 through 1943, the part spent has ranged from more than half a million to below a quarter of a million, with an unexpended balance of nearly a million dollars on December 1, 1943. Expenditures for all purposes except purchases, including a yearly $400,000 for maintenance from New York City, vary from $1,670,000 in 1939 to $1,565,000 in 1943, with a peak of $1,750,000 in 1941, the five-year average being $1,650,000. Thus the national art fund, gauged by a major institution, has not been gravely reduced by the war. How far these figures represent support for living artists is hard to say, since there is no breakdown of purchase-fund columns; obviously the bulk is spent for old masters and the like.

The Museum of Modern Art—representing another type of institution, fifteen years old in comparison with the Metropolitan's seventy-five, having in some ways a wider national audience due to its vigorous circulating-exhibition department—has no vast endowment or plant. Nevertheless, it has expanded its over-all program by economies in installation and operation. From 1939-40 to 1942-43, the museum's annual operating income decreased from $573,000 to $514,000, while purchase funds fluctuated as follows: 1939-40, $82,100; 1940-41, $35,000; 1941-42; $68,000; 1942-43, $40,000. These latter are not an exact figure, however, as certain funds are rigidly restricted.

Many museums may be judged from the record of the art press, which through the war years has printed news of continued activity and purchase. Such a casualty as the San Diego Fine Arts Gallery, in Balboa Park, taken over for a training field, is rare. For the most part, the West Coast museums have been able to maintain a full schedule, including the setting up of recreation centers and art classes for the armed services, even at such heroic cost as the Portland Art Museum, which has discontinued its passenger elevator and has its windows washed only half as often as formerly. In Buffalo, the Albright Gallery is closed mornings in order to be open from 2 to 9:30 p.m., for Buffalo's new industrial population. Finally, one artists' organization, An American Group, reported some time ago that, according to its survey, the purchase funds of 29 museums were *not* frozen. Thus money available through institutions is not appreciably less than it was.

This does not mean that living American artists can count on a peacetime income (inadequate as that was) in wartime; the amounts spent from museum funds to purchase contemporary work have always been meager. A recent press release from the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York, a generous friend of living American artists, suggests the market's inadequacy when it states, "The Museum is pleased to announce that the total sales made to institutions and private collectors from this exhibition totaled $23,750." Inasmuch as the Whitney and the Metropolitan each set aside $10,000 for such purchases, the balance of $3,750 does not represent any frenzied buying of contemporary American painting, sculpture or prints.

In general, increased museum attendance must be interpreted not as diversion, recreation or a substitute for motoring in a gasless period, but as a real search of the human spirit for civilization's underlying moral and cultural energies. In 1943 the Metropolitan Museum had the largest attendance in its history, 1,384,207—a 15-percent increase over 1942. Attendance at the Museum of Modern Art, in spite of a 25-cent admission fee, has shown a steady increase since 1939 save for the first year after our entrance into the war. Furthermore, both the Metropolitan and the Museum of Modern Art have registered record attendances

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for exhibition on war themes. The latter's 1942 "Road to Victory," a mammoth photographic installation organized by Lieutenant-Commander Edward Steichen, USNR, with text by poet Carl Sandburg, was visited by 98,000 people in New York alone, while the 1943 "Airways to Peace" was seen by 113,163. "Road to Victory" circulated widely throughout the United States in cities like Detroit, Rochester, Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis, while a condensed version has gone to England and two, with Spanish text, to Uruguay and Colombia. "Naval Aviation" at the Metropolitan this winter was seen by 95,000, a gain of 10,000 over attendance for the same term last year.

Where there has been a falling-off in attendance, as in Chicago and St. Louis, the explanation is given as being due to transportation shortages, the St. Louis public-school buses, for example, having been eliminated. In Boston, the Museum of Fine Arts reported greatly increased attendance, rising from 416,690 in 1939 to 546,564 in 1942. A small gallery, somewhat off the beaten track, like the Addison Gallery of American Art in Andover, Massachusetts, also reported increased attendance in 1942, despite the decline in pleasure driving, while the Newark Museum in 1942 had an increase of 11 percent over 1941.

Although the reticence which prevents reference to money in the same breath with "art" makes it impossible to quote statistics in regard to the amounts spent for living art, auction-sale figures show that money continues to flow into art as an investment comparable with gold and diamonds. From 1928-29, totals fell to a low of $817,848 in 1934-35. Then they climbed to $4,785,170 in 1940-41, the "best since 1929," with prices reported 20 percent higher than in the previous year, while in 1941-42 the total reached $5,098,484. There is money to spend, but for what? In short, the metropolitan art market continued the steady gains noted from 1937-38, despite a flurry at the end of 1939 when the Whitney Museum omitted its annual purchases and several of the Fifty-seventh Street galleries closed. New York dealers' December sales for 1940 exceeded those of 1939 by 50 percent. A little later, one dealer in old masters reported sales of $250,000 in four weeks' trading, while a dealer in French impressionists reported sales of $110,000, and a dealer in contemporary American art, sales of $33,000. These purchases were made by refugees, undoubtedly as investments in negotiable securities.

It seems that the money spent for art varies in relation to American economic development: in the depression, with the national economy prostrate, only government could rescue art. With quickening industrial production contingent on Lend-Lease and other war activities, national consumer income increased; and as wealth became available once more along the traditional lines of private patronage, cultural institutions responded. At the same time, with economic collapse temporarily averted, the incentive for public-works programs was less. Business as usual, and art as usual, could be carried on as the national income mounted to $140,000,000,000. The dilemma of culture persisted.

Crucial for art in wartime was the "artist-reporter" project of the War Department, but Congress, in June, 1943, turned down a modest item of $125,000 to equip, maintain and compensate forty-two artists for work in the theatres of war. The sum asked was less than one-fifth of one percent of the $71,500,000,000 army appropriation bill of 1943-44. Odd that the city of New York could vote $40,000, to be matched with another $40,000 from the Metropolitan, for a survey of the museum's postwar needs, while the United States of America could not afford a sum slightly larger to record the war. The sums granted annually to Martin Dies would have given the nation an abundant pictorial record of its fighting men and their campaigns. (About the same time Dr. Albert C. Barnes, according to the art press, paid $175,000 for a Renoir.) Yet in every important American war from the Revolution on, our artists have been present at the front as visual historians and recorders.[1] It remained for private enterprise—Life, Collier's and other magazines, plus concerns like Abbott Laboratories—to take over the task rejected by the electorate's representative body, Congress. From the point of view of both esthetics and history, the results have been distressing.

In this picture of unabated institutional support for art but little support (public or private) for living art, the contradictions stand out in bold relief. The fact is underlined by the thriving existence of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe. Granted, a necessary and indispensable work, but shall we not also salvage artistic and historic values in the life of our own time? The tenseness of the dilemma may be noted in the war of ideas between "American" and "European" art. For a decade now there has been a rising nationalism in American painting and sculpture, as Americans found deep roots in the rediscovery of their native land. The extreme of this ideological development has been regionalism, whereas its healthy aspect has been the decentralization of art referred to above. Now, as throughout our history, we are once again "the asylum of the oppressed," and the School of Paris comes *en masse* for refuge here. As a result of this latest cultural immigration, the United States has received another injection of the intellectualism and formalism from which there was a swing away in the depression; and the return to the American

[1] A comprehensive study of the part played by American artists in American wars is being prepared by Private Lincoln Kirstein, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, and will be published under the joint auspices of the National Gallery of Art and the Museum of Modern Art. Extracts appeared in the March, April and May issues of the Magazine of Art. – E. MCC.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tradition of realism has in part been halted. Aside from esthetic effects, there is the ancient conflict between humanitarianism and self-interest. Our visitors find exhibition space, make sales, obtain desirable teaching posts, while many good American artists are without adequate material means. Here nationalism and internationalism clash, in culture and in economics. Here, in short, is an alien culture, temporarily grafted on the native. The presence of the articulate, much-sympathized-with "artists in exile" is bound to create tension.

A more important problem is what may loosely be called the cartelization of culture. Perhaps a more colloquial term would be "canned culture." At any rate, an increasingly evident and powerful manifestation in the art world, which continues to grow in the war years, is the practice of circulating exhibitions. Originating in an handful of major museums, such exhibitions are eagerly rented by smaller and less wealthy institutions throughout the United States, because they cost less and obviate the considerable curatorial labor of organizing exhibitions independently. Thus the taste and esthetic criteria—in total, the world outlook—of a small handful of museum potentates is imposed on the nation. Independent museums are in the same position as the independent press: a cultural monopoly can dictate the art of the country, just as a news-gathering monopoly can dictate what wire news is available to the people of the United States, or a chain of papers can mold opinion with its headlines, editing of news, and the like. This phenomenon has never been adequately studied, or even commented on.

Important, too, are the art activities which serve as ambassadors of good will to foreign countries, particularly to the Latin American republics. A major exhibition, organized by the Metropolitan, the Museum of Modern Art, the Whitney Museum and the Brooklyn Museum, was sent on a 50,000-mile tour of our neighbors to the south. Here again a specialized sector of taste prevailed, say "arrived" modern, "arrived" American. Notably lacking was the representation of schools of esthetic opinion as far apart as the so-called social-content movement and abstractionism. In assembling exhibitions in Latin America to show here in the United States, it seems that the groups represented have most often been institutional and academic in character, with a resulting tinge in the work selected. It may be that the *sindicatos* of the Latin American republics were consulted in these choices; but internal evidence does not seem to indicate this. Nevertheless, the exchange of exhibitions between Americans of the North and of the South is eminently desirable; and by the circulation of these throughout the country a worth-while objective has been aided.

Another new development is the emergence of labor as art patron. A century and more ago artisans' and mechanics' institutes battled to found the nation's free public-school system, to give democracy a broad educational base. Today it may be that, old forms of patronage having proved frozen in old patterns of action and thought, new forms are about to evolve. For some years now there has been tentative cooperation between organized labor and the artists. In 1942, things began to happen. In August of that year Local 599, UAW-CIO, made a liaison with the Flint Institute of Arts to hold forums on art for labor. In October the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union held an exhibition at the Ferargil Galleries in New York, and in the spring of 1943 another at the American-British Art Center. Two locals of this union, Nos. 9 and 22, have for some years conducted art classes for their members. In the fall of 1942, also, the Metropolitan Museum's educational department held a series of four forums on "Labor and Art in the United Nations," continuing activities of the spring and summer when labor groups visited the museum.

Recent activities originating in union membership have been two exhibitions in connection with National Negro Week—the joint display of Locals 144-6 of the Hotel and Club Employees' Union, AFL, and that of the Joint Board of Fur Dressers' and Dyers' Unions, both in New York. One may add a reference to the poster competition held two or three years ago by the Oil Workers' Organizing Committee. In addition, the National Maritime Union, the State, County and Municipal Workers, Local 18, UOPWA, the Book and Magazine Union and Local 65, the Warehouse Workers' Union, are but a few of the labor groups which hold art classes for their members. For the second year, merchant seamen have exhibited at the Grand Central Art Galleries in New York, with a good press. A recent report is that Local 600, UAW, in the Ford Detroit plant, has a photography class. The next step, of course, is to transform this new audience into buyers of art.

Reports from the Metropolitan and the Museum of Modern Art of increased sales of popular-priced color reproductions indicate one way this may be brought about. Evidently sharing the wealth through increased consumer purchasing power creates new markets for art (a truth understood also in the drive to merchandise art through department stores). All that remains, in peacetime, is to distribute the vastly expanded national income along the lines set forth by the President in his second (economic) Bill of Rights speech. Meanwhile, as in all other areas of national life, artists and all those concerned with the fate of art in America look ahead to the postwar period and understand that planning is required for art as for all creative social functions. With the issue of progress or reaction posed in American life, artists can see as well as other citizens what the duties of the future are.

ELIZABETH MCCAUSLAND

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Good News from the South

THE VICTORIES of Senator Pepper of Florida and Senator Hill of Alabama should give new courage to all who believe in democracy. The voters of those two states gave a good account of themselves. All the forces of reaction were arrayed against the only two progressive Senators from the Deep South. Enormous campaign funds were at the disposal of their opponents. Thousands of young men who would have supported Hill or Pepper were in the armed forces and unable to vote. Bitter racial antagonisms were aroused to frighten the gullible. The leading opponents were able, effective, popular public figures—the strongest men in the conservative camp. Yet Hill and Pepper came through with votes to spare.

Most heartening fact of all is that the violent anti-Negro campaign did not succeed—in fact, it boomeranged. Particularly in Alabama it was carried too far, and many responsible white leaders who did not want the status quo disturbed called upon the inciters of race hate to stop before violence occurred.

In Alabama there was one upset that almost no one expected. Representative Joe Starnes, vice-chairman of the Dies Committee and an effective rabble-rouser, was defeated. The success of Albert Rains, his opponent, could hardly be called a clear-cut victory for liberalism, but his defeat of Starnes showed that one of the most unenlightened sections of the state rebelled against the demagoguery and effort to be all things to all men of a Representative who thought his position was secure.

Starnes was the darling of the Birmingham industrialists. They looked upon him as a possible successor to Senator Bankhead. He was a regular tub-thumper at meetings of the State Chamber of Commerce and of the Associated Industries of Alabama (NAM subsidiary). Then he would go back to his district. In the northern part of it he would shout for the TVA, for which he was in fact an effective fighter in Congress. In Gadsden, where labor was strong, Starnes said he was a friend of labor. In the rural districts he damned John L. Lewis and shrieked against aliens. His opponent, Rains, had the support of labor, but that was not the decisive factor. A lot of people just saw through Joe Starnes.

In Jefferson County (Birmingham), Representative Newsome was forced into a run-off. Two years ago he defeated Luther Patrick, a New Deal partisan who was a good deal of a clown. Many liberals voted against Patrick then because they were disgusted with his rattlebrain tactics and buffoonery; they thought that they would prefer a sensible middle-of-the-roader like Newsome. Now most of them are returning to Patrick, having found Newsome thoroughly reactionary. All signs point to a close contest.

I take my logic lessons at the feet of the great in the United States Senate. After listening to a speech by Taft a few days ago I came to the logical conclusion that the United States never should have broken diplomatic relations with Germany or Japan. Senators Taft and Wheeler were doing their daily bit to undermine Soviet-American relations. The argument got around to Finland. Each Senator commended the State Department for maintaining relations with Finland. "It seems to me," said Taft in summing up his argument, "that when we are assisting Russia with Lend-Lease arms which may be used against Finland, we have a distinct obligation to confer constantly with Russia and with Finland."

Ergo, it seems to me that when we are assisting England with Lend-Lease arms which may be used against Germany and Japan, we have a distinct obligation to confer constantly with England and with Germany and Japan.

Scott Russell, chief counsel for the Special Senate Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, was recently described to me by a conservative Georgian as "the most reactionary man in Georgia." Russell was formerly president of the Bibb Manufacturing Company of Macon. He was appointed by Senator George, the chairman of the postwar committee. He occupies a highly important position.

The reactionary direction in which the committee is going is beginning to be recognized. Labor groups are belatedly going to war on the committee's activities. They mustered their strength at the last moment to oppose the Murray-George contract-termination measure, but the line-up was solidly against them. Senator Kilgore's attempts to amend the bill were brushed aside without a record vote. A few moments later the bill was passed by acclamation. Kilgore was the only man who attempted to show the bill's weaknesses.

Senators Vandenberg, George, Austin, Murray and Barkley spearheaded the drive to pass the bill, which had the approval of business. But Kilgore made each of them promise to see that early consideration is given to his proposals to deal with the human side of demobilization.

The chief weakness of Kilgore's position was that there has not been enough creative thinking on the whole problem of human demobilization. Various individuals and organizations have conducted their own investigations. But no cohesive policy by labor and liberal groups has developed. Business does have its program for getting its money out of the war, and that program was embodied in the termination bill passed by the Senate.

Notes: Reports on President Roosevelt's health continue to be encouraging. . . . Some Washington lawyers think that the sedition trial will never be concluded. They think it will end in a mistrial. . . . Vice President Wallace will go to the Democratic convention as head of the Iowa delegation. He was named delegate by the State Democratic Convention, which recently adopted the slogan: "Win the war and secure the peace with Roosevelt and Wallace." . . . The Polish vote is going to be an important factor in the campaign. On May 3, the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, Senators and Representatives spent most of their time on the floor eulogizing Poland. There were many sharp criticisms of Soviet policy.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Personnel Department

HOLLYWOOD'S SUPPLY OF PLAYERS has been affected in two ways by the war: a large number of familiar and experienced performers have been taken out of the studios and put somewhere in the armed forces; and an equally large number of new players have been replacing them. The following people strike me as being notable additions.

Gene Kelly, Keenan Wynn and Percy Kilbride were all recruited from the theatre. Kelly, whose most recent picture is "Cover Girl," has been cast either as the smart, tough young hero or as the unfortunate half of the song and dance team, but his progress and accomplishment have been far more unusual than the stock characters he has played. No other young player to my knowledge gets over a particular attitude and response with as much clarity and sharp effect, or with as much uncorrupted feeling, and I have seen him do a variety of characterizations with equal success. He plays up the smaller responses of his part without killing the character they are part of. The two things he does least well—singing and dancing—are what he is given most consistently to do.

Wynn and Kilbride are both supporting comic performers who invariably make the parts of the picture they are in very bright and exciting. The former is the son of a fine influence, Ed Wynn, and provided two corrupt, cynical notes for two otherwise completely sweet shows—"See Here, Private Hargrove," and "The Lost Angel." In the latter he helped Margaret O'Brien, who is also good, and new, and only seven years old, relieve a basically terrible moment where she is supposed to teach him better than to be a gangster, by doing a bored, enigmatic kind of gangsterism, and by his virtuosity in capping and explaining situations with some business with his hands or face. In the sophomoric "See Here, Private Hargrove" he has a more unusual screen character to play, the young man (found in every college dormitory) with a passion for promoting small business on the side as he goes through basic training. He fills the role well, with the necessary amount of sinister, thick-skinned greediness that responds with a mildly disfavoring blankness to anything except the success or failure of one of his business deals. Kilbride is the character with the Buster Keaton kind of face and the absurd caricature of a New England farmer's voice, who is usually inserted into films to whip them up somewhere and does it in a clear, wonderful manner. It turns out that along with the comic quality of Kilbride's face and voice, he is one of the most subtle and inventive comic spirits to hit Hollywood in years. It seems to me that Kilbride is capable of becoming a great movie comic, directly in the great line of Keaton and Chaplin, if he is given the necessary featuring and freedom.

I also recommend any performance by Roman Bohnen, Henry Morgan or Alexander Granach, William Eythe's in "The Song of Bernadette" and Bill Phillips' in "See Here, Private Hargrove."

By far the most unusual phenomenon in the advent of new players is the type of heroine being introduced simultaneously by most of the studios—girls with a spectacular amount of breeding, intelligence and acting ambition. Some of their names are Jean Sullivan, Jean Heather, Eleanor Parker, Susan Peters and Mary Anderson. I think the idea is for rival studios to cash in on the success of the styles of Ingrid Bergman and Teresa Wright, and to show soldiers the kind of girl they should wait for, look for or expect when they get back. To be a good fit as this soldier ideal these young film heroines have something from all the former Lady categories. This includes the ambition of the great acting ladies like Bette Davis, the body of the bathing beauty, the face and wholesomeness of the girl who plays Sister in family movies, and the free-swinging, sexual lustiness of the vampire women. But they have also the added jigger of sensitivity. For that jigger they are indebted to Bergman; also they use her worst cutenesses, and that eager kind of acting intelligence which in some of the actresses makes you feel that they read and understood the script and then hid the hero's before he could read his. I think they have also been influenced by Teresa Wright, the kind of face she has and the respectable clothes she wears, which are sold in Junior Miss departments. They are also usually hung in that troublesome state between girlhood and womanhood that Miss Wright plays so well. There is no denying their interest in acting, their intelligence about what they are supposed to be doing and their desire to be better than anything.

There are other new heroines, fashioned along more traditional lines, including Ella Raines, K. T. Stevens, Donna Reed and Marsha Hunt. Miss Hunt has a good amount of talent, drive and sincerity, and has decided to follow the Davis-Lupino road, which is founded on the basic realization that life is hard, severe and bitter. As a result she shows little in the way of softness or relaxation, even when there is no great demand for her tense, belligerent manner.

Perhaps Paramount's Gail Russell, who was introduced in "The Uninvited," has the greatest effectiveness of the new crop of heroines, because of her unusual kind of screen beauty—that which gets lost in fairy tales, or is saved by a Knight of the Round Table—but she has carefully turned all of her mannerisms into a pure demonstration of that beauty.

MANNY FARBER

The Bandwagon

On March 2, 1944 . . . [Sewell] Avery attacked the philosophy that the chief responsibility of business after the war is to provide jobs for everyone.

"A corporation's efficiency is indicated by the number of men it can release from a job, not by the number of men hired," Avery said.—*From The Chicago Sun.*

Sponsors of the measure [enactment of a Japanese exclusion ordinance] contend that unless steps are taken "it is apparent that in the future Grand Island may be overrun with Japanese." It was pointed out that a Japanese family had purchased a home in the southwestern section of the city.—*From The Lincoln (Nebraska) Journal.*

. . . Sellers [Attorney General of Texas] declared the Court's opinion was so broad that apparently there was no possible device to exclude Negroes from party primary elections

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as long as the state on the general election ballot recognizes the party nominees.

"In view of this opinion, I would not be surprised to see the Jim Crow law go next," Sellers asserted. – *AP dispatch from Austin, Texas.*

On the Home Front

America's finest shaving product, a brush of hand-picked badger hair set in rubber. Unbreakable Bakelite handle. The largest and finest one is $125. – *An advertisement in The New York Times.*

That All-Out Effort

D-DAY

History is now being made. Eventful happenings are at the front.

Your visit to Louis Brown also will be D-day. Here you will see England's finest suitings expertly cut and custom tailored to your individual figure. – *An advertisement in The Washington Post.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Humanizing Modern Achievements

SIR: A short and inoffensive section of Mr. Malcolm Cowley's article, "Marginalia," in your issue of April 17, seems to me to be symptomatic of a misapplication of values which is the curse of most of our journals of opinion, and, to a deeper extent, of the departments of humanities of our liberal-arts colleges. I refer to the few paragraphs of the above article in which Mr. Cowley criticizes the fourteenth edition of the "Britannica" for the omission of some forty columns of Saintsbury's article on French literature. The state of mind to which I refer may be summed up briefly as follows: All genuine and lasting values in a given culture are to be found in literature and, possibly, in philosophy, but nowhere else. I submit that in an age dominated by science and technology, this attitude is ridiculous and even harmful. And it is not only fostered by the so-called humanists of the schools, but also by literary critics who claim to be their enemies in the realm of ideas.

My own view, neither unique nor original, is that by far the greater part of our physical and imaginative energies are today absorbed by technics and science, particularly as it is associated with technology, and further, that the deepest and truest synthesis of the divergent forces of our age may be found in technics and the construction arts. In the related fields of modern architecture, construction engineering, geo-architecture and in industrial design, we have come closest to reconciling the centrifugal tendencies which produced the disastrous split between activity and feeling in the nineteenth century. While exploitative capacities ran unchecked in one direction, values bound up with the esthetic experience (I use the phrase in Dewey's sense) retreated into a sterile traditionalism or eclecticism. The synthesis necessary can come only through reconciliation of building capacity with the harmonizing and vitalizing characteristics of a vigorous social art.

The values which are embodied in literature, and which criticism and interpretation seek to reveal, are of lasting importance, some of them perhaps universal so far as human activity is concerned. Is it not time that we began to consider the humanization of modern society by humanizing its most extensive achievements? It may be possible to evaluate these achievements according to the same criteria that we employ in examination of the other arts. The ordering and integrating genius, from the technical, biological and esthetic standpoints, expressed in the physical plant of the TVA, for example, is absolutely unparalleled in history. I doubt if one can be accused of philistinism if he ventures to point out that we can learn at least as much from the tremendous organizational capacity exhibited in the construction and operation of Boulder Dam as we can from the missing forty columns of Saintsbury's history of French literature. Perhaps we should pay men to review dams for the public as well as books, or to review parkways, bridges and town planning. A courageous periodical like The New Republic, for the most part devoted to reason in society, might consider seriously a monthly review of progress in the industrial and construction arts. An enthusiasm for the kind of creative work that Americans understand might dull the enthusiasm for the mythologies and superstitions which beset us today.

CARL W. CONDIT

The University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.

Academic Freedon at Iowa State, Cont'd

SIR: With reference to the correspondence in The New Republic of May 1, 1944, between Professors Buchanan and McNeill on the violation of academic freedom at Iowa State College, one significant fact was omitted.

Mr. Fred Larrabee, president of the Iowa State Dairy Association, has openly boasted that the suppression of the pamphlet which states that margarine is the nutritional equal of butter was one of the organization's major accomplishments in 1943.

This statement, which appears in the newspaper PM of March 14, 1944, is all the admission needed by Professor McNeill to support his contention that the incident of withdrawing the pamphlet is a clear-cut case of denial of academic freedom and of supposedly objective scientists bowing to the will of selfish business interests.

New York City BERNARD LEWIS

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Private Charles N. Barnard, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, writes to make a suggestion for housing that part of the population which will be affected by slum clearance after the war. He suggests that the military posts, which are now located in every state in the Union, be used as a temporary expedient. In this way a threefold objective might be accomplished: "That of slum clearance without haste (so that the new structures would not have to be shabbily constructed); utilization of a huge public investment (the camps), and the education of a portion of our citizenry in the problems of successful community life" (through the civic centers of the camps).

Dick Meier and Gitta Ayers of Berkeley, California, propose, as a focal point for world thought and debate, an International University. Such a university, they say, would provide an educational center where the potential leaders of the various nations might become qualified for leadership, and where there might be a reciprocal flow of intellectual, spiritual and cultural resources among the nations, to the better understanding and enrichment of all.

The American Library Association tells us that Archibald MacLeish has stated, in connection with Russia Book Week, that the establishment of a Slavic Center in the Library of Congress is being planned to foster cultural interchange between the United States and Russia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

A Preface to Kierkegaard

IN A JUST WORLD, translators would be paid ten times as much as authors. Their work cannot be other than tedious, their names are soon forgotten, yet one has only to try to imagine what our cultural life would be like without Ibsen, Tolstoy and Hans Andersen, not to mention the French or German authors, to realize our dependence upon them. To Messrs. Lowrie, Swenson, Dru, Payne and others, and to the Oxford, Princeton and other presses who during the last five or six years have been making Kierkegaard available in English, we and our children shall owe a debt which we could not repay even if we remembered it.

As Mr. Lowrie points out in his preface, "Either/Or" is one of the less important books of a very important author. This makes it difficult to review. Those who have realized Kierkegaard's importance, will buy it anyway; those to whom his works are still unfamiliar, should not begin with this one. The Christian would do better, I think, to start with "Fear and Trembling" or "Training in Christianity"; the philosopher, with his masterpiece, "Concluding Unscientific Postscript"; the psychologist, with "Sickness unto Death"; and the general reader, with "The Present Age," perhaps, or "The Journals."

As a Christian, Kierkegaard belongs to the tradition of religious thinking—theology is too systematic a term—represented by Augustine, Pascal, Newman and Karl Barth, as distinct both from the Thomist tradition of official Catholicism and from the liberal Protestantism of men like Schleiermacher. As a secular dialectician, he is one of the great exponents of an approach, equally hostile to Cartesian mechanism and Hegelian idealism, to which the Germans have given the name Existential—though it is confined neither to Germans like Nietzsche, Jaspers, Scheler, Heidegger, but may be found, for instance, in Bergson and William James, nor to professional philosophers, for the same approach is typical of what is most valuable in Marx and Freud.

In contrast to those philosophers who begin by considering the *objects* of human knowledge, essences and relations, the existential philosopher begins with man's immediate experience as a *subject, i. e.*, as a being in *need*, an *interested* being whose existence is at stake. He does not assert, as he is usually accused of asserting, the primacy of Will over Reason, but their inseparability. As Augustine says: "I am and know and will; I am knowing and willing; I know myself to be and to will; I will to be and to know." There is, therefore, no timeless, disinterested I who stands outside my finite temporal self and serenely knows whatever there is to know; cognition is always a specific historic act accompanied by hope and fear. To realize this is not, again, to abandon as hopeless the search for common sharable truth and surrender to a subjective relativism: on the contrary, it is precisely in the interest of such a common truth, that it is necessary for the individual to begin by learning to be objective about his subjectivity, "to know his station," to become conscious every time he asks calmly of an object or an event, "What are you?" of his urgent, simultaneous aside, "Be this. Don't be that."

From this viewpoint, the basic human problem is man's anxiety in time; *e. g.*, his present anxiety over himself in relation to his past and his parents (Freud), his present anxiety over himself in relation to his future and his neighbors (Marx), his present anxiety over himself in relation to eternity and God (Kierkegaard).

Man, says Kierkegaard, is not only a being, like an atom of hydrogen, but also a being who becomes, and not only a being who becomes, as an acorn becomes an oak tree, but a conscious being who at every moment must choose of his own free will one out of an infinite number of possibilities which he foresees. Moreover, each choice is irrevocable, *i. e.*, man has, both individually and socially, a *history;* what happens to him does not happen *in* time, but time itself happens in what he does. Hence his anxiety, for he can neither guarantee nor undo the consequence of any choice he makes. The power by which, without blinding himself to his anxiety, he is nevertheless still able to choose, is religious faith: without that faith, he must either despair, *i. e.*, be unable to act, or become an idolater, *i. e.*, invent an illusion of absolute certainty out of the individual passion of his immediate moods (the Esthetic) or the universal abstractions of his intellect (the Ethical). Such an endeavor is, however, doomed to failure because he cannot trust to one without excluding the other; yet he can only repress. He cannot get rid of either, nor prevent the excluded half of his nature from exposing the pretensions of the trusted half, and so leading him back to despair.

In "Either/Or," Kierkegaard has much to say about the Esthetic and the Ethical, but refers little to the Religious (by which he means the Christian faith), so that the distinction between the two latter is not so clear as it becomes in his later work. The distinction is so vital that I shall try to explain briefly what I think Kierkegaard means by these three terms.

Take some human action, say a theft. The Esthetic will ask, "How much passion is involved?" and judge it in terms of the more or less interesting. Thus, esthetically, it is uninteresting if a professional burglar steals or a clergyman refrains from stealing, but interesting if it is the other way around.

The Ethical will ask, "What happens?" and give its judgment in the all-or-none terms of good or bad. Ethically, it makes no difference whether the thief is a starving man who steals a loaf for his children, or a millionaire who embezzles a thousand dollars.

[1] Either/Or, by Soren Kierkegaard. Translated by David F. Swenson, Lillian Marvin Swenson and Walter Lowrie. Princeton: Princeton University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. In two volumes; 714 pages. $7.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Religious will ask, "How much proof of faith is offered?" and give its judgment in terms of innocence and guilt. Thus in treating the theft as an individual act of will which cannot be judged in abstraction from the concrete temporal situation in which it occurs, the Religious sides with the Esthetic against the Ethical in upholding the unique importance of the individual will. But in asserting that the good act—not stealing—is always and only the product of a good will, and the bad act—stealing—always the product of an evil will, it sides with the Ethical against the Esthetic belief that to will is valuable in itself. Lastly, it disagrees with both in blessing an act neither for its manifestly interesting appearance nor for its demonstrably good result, but for its hidden subjective intention.

To the Esthetic as the Ethical, any suffering involved in an act is accidental and without significance in itself, but to the Religious it is precisely in the suffering that the significance lies. In betraying his best friend and her husband, Tristan and Isolde both suffer from guilt but less than they would suffer from frustrated desire if they remained faithful to their vows, and did not make Mark suffer at all. The Esthetic requires Mark to suffer, and Tristan and Isolde to suffer from guilt rather than from frustration, not for their own sakes, but because that makes an interesting situation. The Ethical demands that they remain faithful and, perceiving that the obstacle to this is their desire, would willingly substitute for the love-potion a good strong sedative, for it is concerned, not with how they feel, but only with how they act, and condemns them accordingly. The Religious, on the other hand, blesses Tristan and Isolde only in so far as they really do suffer from guilt, and could bless them wholeheartedly only if they had chosen instead to suffer from frustration; it blesses Mark the most, first, because his suffering is, relatively, innocent, and second, because (a little late in the day) he accepts his suffering and forgives his betrayers. If the latter, by taking a sedative, had ceased to be tempted, their fidelity would have ceased to have any religious significance one way or the other.

"Either/Or" is a hodge-podge of aphorisms, essays, reviews, journals, letters—the lack of systematic form is as intentional as it is in Nietzsche's work—in which, under various dramatic aliases, Kierkegaard considers the erotic relation and is concerned to show that, for an individual who has once been exposed to Christianity, there are, irrespective of his or her belief, only three possibilities: marriage; celibacy (the exceptional case for which there must be some cause *outside* the individual's choice that compels it, for it is presumptuous to will to be an exception); and despair. The possibility of a healthy paganism is excluded, because that presupposes a childlike trust in esthetic immediacy—my feelings are not really *mine* but given me by the gods—which is destroyed the moment I become aware of possessing a definite continuing self. Henceforth I can never live naïvely in the moment; I can only stand outside it and command it to command me.

> Eros was the god of love, but he was not himself in love. In so far as the other gods or men felt the power of love in themselves, they ascribed it to Eros, referred it to him, but Eros was not himself in love. . . . That which constitutes the power of the god is not in the god, but in all the other individuals who refer it to him; he is himself, as it were, powerless and impotent, because he communicates his power to the whole world.

But once I have realized that Eros is not, in fact, a god, but, as Dante says, "an accident occurring in a substance," if I continue to worship erotic immediacy, I am worshiping myself, and the continual need to escape from my own awareness of this—which I must try to escape, since no one can *believe* in himself as God—gives my life a demonic and quite unpagan intensity and I become a seducer.

> When one considers Greek love, it is, according to its own ideas, essentially faithful. . . . It is accidental in the certain individual that he loves many, and with regard to the many he loves, it is again accidental every time he loves a new one. Don Juan, on the contrary, is not faithful but absolutely faithless: he loves not one but all, that is to say, he seduces all. He exists only in the moment, but the moment is in its conception considered the sum of the moments, and so we have the seducer.

In "The Banquet," Johannes says that woman is a bait set by the jealous gods to entrap man in finiteness, but he, the seducer, by perceiving the ruse, is able to dine without being entrapped, for he practises in the erotic sphere what Kierkegaard calls the Rotation Method:

> The whole secret lies in arbitrariness. People usually think it is easy to be arbitrary, but it requires much study to succeed in being arbitrary so as not to lose oneself in it, but so as to derive satisfaction from it. One does not enjoy the immediate, but something quite different which he can arbitrarily control. You go to see the middle of a play, you read the third part of a book. . . . You look at everything in life from the standpoint of a wager, and so forth. The more rigidly consistent you are in holding fast to your arbitrariness, the more amusing the ensuing combinations will be.

The Or which, by the mouth of Judge Williams, Kierkegaard offers to the Either of esthetic despair is fidelity to a single choice, which does not mean that the choice is made once and for all, but that it is continually rechosen at each successive moment, so that one's career becomes a vocation, and one's love a marriage.

Paganism had a god of love, but no god of marriage. Zeus and Hera, however, as *guardians* of marriage were called Teleios and Teleia, which indicates the pagan conception of marriage as an ethical relation, in contrast to the esthetic relation of love, *i. e.*, as a social or biological obligation to which the will of the individual is of no account, since it does not exist for his or her sake, but for the sake of the state, or property rights, or race, in the same way that it has been said that the hen is the egg's device for producing more eggs.

The reason given in the Bible for the creation of woman, on the other hand, is that "it is not good for man to be alone," *i. e.*, the propagation of the human species is the effect of a relation between individual persons, not its cause. It is required for a Christian marriage, therefore, that the bride and bridegroom shall come to the altar in the state which they thereupon promise to continue, *i. e.*, before they can choose to love, love must first of all have chosen them. First comes the esthetic immediacy, which to the Ethical is irrelevant, then the vow, taken by each, to love each other

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NIGHT IS ENDING

By James Ronald

Author of *Old Soldiers Never Die*

A full-bodied novel of England between two wars. Its heroine, Ruth Malvern, becomes as real and as important to you as a long-cherished friend. With her you overcome private tragedy, sustain the outcast, find happiness in their brightened future, share, in the end, the radiant promise of an enduring love. You live, in her story, through years crowded with activity and dreams, crowned with fulfillment.

3rd printing before publication. $2.75

NEW *Lippincott* BOOKS

WALTER DURANTY

has written "The coolest and best one-volume interpretation of Soviet Russia yet published."

—Lewis Gannett, *N. Y. Herald Tribune*

U

"Pulls no punches to soften the truth for either Americans or Russians."
—JOSEPH BARNES

S

"It is that rarest of things, a book on Russia that tells the truth fairly and objectively."—JOHN GUNTHER

S

"A book that ought to be read thoughtfully by all Americans."—Boston Post

R

THE STORY OF SOVIET RUSSIA

Second printing

$3.00

THE SEAS OF GOD

Edited by

Whit Burnett

"Solace for the mind and heart" in 49 great stories of the human spirit. "A book to enlist any serious man's attention and to command his spiritual respect . . . Answers a poignant need of the times."
—*N. Y. Times Book Review*

"There is inspiration in these pages, and faith, too, of the kind we need in wartime."—*Chicago News.* $3.00

A Story Press Book

THE BOWL OF BRASS

By Paul I. Wellman

Author of *Jubal Troop*

A novel of the high hard plains where weaklings have no place. "Realism of the most rugged sort . . . strong in earthy flavor and rough humor. It is easily his best work of fiction."—*Kansas City Star.* "A red-blooded . . . rousing story."—Lewis Gannett, *N. Y. Herald Tribune.* "Above all, it is good story-telling."—*Chicago News*

2nd printing. $2.75

YOURS IS THE EARTH

By Margaret Vail

Her husband was captured by the Nazis; her home was overrun. She fled, with young Rose Hélene, from Paris to Unoccupied France to North Africa, back to France, over the Pyrenees and at last to America. The story of one brave woman and her small daughter . . . a record of private heroism, quietly told, infinitely moving. 2nd Printing $3.00

MARY O'HARA'S

THUNDERHEAD

is "filled with the intense horse-and-boy emotion that made *My Friend Flicka* so memorably alive."—*N. Y. Herald Tribune* $2.75

and

MY FRIEND FLICKA

is "a beautiful book."—*N. Y. Herald Tribune.* "As good as everyone says it is."
—*N. Y. Times* $2.50

Story Press Novels

If you haven't yet read them, isn't it time you did?

DAVY JONES, I Love You

By F. R. Buckley

The hearty, pungent story of a ship and her crew . . . crammed to the hatches with tense action, salted with humor, glowing with the simple courage of brave men. Written in Conrad's tradition, with an eye for drama, a ear for virulent speech and a comprehending heart. "A delight to read."
— Donald Gordon, *American News of Books.* Illustrated. $2.50

J.B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY
Philadelphia • New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

till death, which to the Esthetic is absurd. But it is precisely the combination that makes marriage a religious sacrament, the proof of which is that it can neither be conceived in the timeless abstractions of the Ethical, nor in the foreshortened time of the Esthetic.

Religious significance is, in fact, inseparable from history, in which time is neither conquered nor escaped, but possessed:

> When love is conceived as it is in the romances, the individual is merely brought to the point where he will open—with that it ends; or he is about to open but is interrupted. Pride can very well be represented [by Art], for the essential point in pride is not succession but intensity in the moment. Humility is represented with difficulty, because here if anywhere we are dealing with succession . . . and when it is shown in its ideal moment, the beholder senses the lack of something, because he feels that its true ideality does not consist in the fact that it is ideal in the moment but that it is constant. Romantic love can very well be represented in the moment, but conjugal love cannot, because an ideal husband is not one who is such once in his life but one who every day is such. If I would represent a hero who conquers kingdoms and lands, it can very well be represented in the moment, but a cross-bearer who every day takes up his cross cannot be represented either in poetry or in art, because the point is that he does it every day.

The one artistic medium that can represent such things is music, but only as a paradox, only because music does *not* represent or imitate anything, but is itself the exact opposite of the religious, pure, sensual immediacy. Kierkegaard's essay on music is the only illuminating suggestion for a musical esthetic that I have seen.

Kierkegaard is a dangerous author, because the more he attracts, the more he has the opposite effect to the one he intends, which is to throw the reader back upon his own experience. To become a disciple of Kierkegaard is to betray him, for what he would teach is an approach to oneself, not a conclusion, a style of questioning to apply to all one's experience, including one's experience of reading him. The fatal follies of Marxists and Freudians should forewarn us from becoming Kierkegaardians, even if we will not listen to his own repeated warning, which Marx and Freud conspicuously fail to give, that he is a genius, not an apostle.

W. H. AUDEN

"Library of the Burned Books"

WHEN I HEAR the word 'culture,' I slip back the safety-catch of my revolver." One remembers this remark of the favored Nazi dramatist, Hans Johst. One was disgusted or amused at hearing this from a writer, but it was wrong to be amused or to consider the sentence a paradox. It is a confession of belief. The Nazis took it literally: one of their first major acts was the "cleansing and purging" of German libraries, bookstores and publishing houses of "trash"—*i. e.*, the works of literature, philosophy and science, from Gotthold Ephraim Lessing to Heinrich and Thomas Mann, from Spinoza and Voltaire to Romain Rolland, Freud, Einstein, H. G. Wells and Gorky.

The occasion for recalling these well known facts is the anniversary of the burning of the books, May 10, 1933, on public squares all over Germany, a date which revealed its real significance exactly seven years later when the German armies started their blitz against the Low Countries and France. The coincidence of the dates is striking. May 10, 1940, was the direct consequence of May 10, 1933. The "realist politicians" will never understand this, for they see only the superficial reality of the facts of the day. They lack and even scorn the ability to look behind the facts and recognize their inherent meaning. They take it as an empirical experience that one can do business without having read Voltaire or Lessing, and they deduce that one also can do business with a government which burns Lessing's works.

Only imaginative men, "dreamers," those who are not content merely to note the facts but who also consider them as symbols of social, political, spiritual and human currents, have understood in time the real meaning of the "symbolic action" of the *auto-da-fé's*. They knew that the organized annihilation of culture in Germany would be followed in due time by the suppression of culture all over Europe. They knew that the counterpart of the war against humanism in Germany was the preparation for the war against humanity. They knew that those who burned the books one day would set fire to the whole world.

A group of these "dreamers" gathered on May 10, 1934, in a small wooden house on the Boulevard Arago in Paris. They were, in addition to some French confrères, German writers in exile, and they established the "Library of the Burned Books," in which were collected all those works which were banned, forbidden, censored or suppressed in Nazi Germany. A number of German intellectuals had managed to save their libraries, and as they were hardly able to keep even a fraction of these books in their small Paris hotel rooms, they were glad to lend thousands of volumes to the "Library of the Burned Books"—in fact many more than we were able to display in the two rooms of the wooden building.

The money to rent the house and to run the modest institution had come from England, where H. G. Wells, Lady Oxford and Asquith, Professor and Mrs. Haldane, Wickham Steed, Professor Harold Laski and a number of others (among whom were also Miss Vera Brittain) had formed a "Society of the Friends of the Burned Books" and collected the necessary funds.

The Library was presided over by H. G. Wells, Romain Rolland, André Gide and Heinrich Mann. It became a center of intellectual anti-Nazi activities, not because of the books it possessed—one could find most of them in other libraries—but because of its archives, which classified in several hundred sections tens of thousands of clippings, documents, photographs, etc., on the history of Nazism and the anti-Nazi fight in all its forms. Writers, journalists, foreign correspondents, historians, economists and politicians used this reliably documented material in a number of books and articles. Instead of utilizing this unique collection, the French government sequestered the Library on the first day of the war. Everybody who was connected with the Library or with the League of German Writers in Exile—and that included about 95 percent of all German writers in France—was (rightly) suspected of being an anti-Nazi and, since Hitler's friends were already virtually in power in France, was thrown into a prison or a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concentration camp. When the Nazis occupied Paris, the Library and its archives were politely handed over to the Gestapo. This is the brief, honorable and very significant history of the Library of the Burned Books.

But the real significance of the Library was not confined to its material existence. When we inaugurated it, we wanted to make that day of shame a day of glory for literature and for freedom of thought which no tyrant could kill by fire. And furthermore, by this symbolic action, we wanted to awaken Europe to the dangers which threatened its spiritual as well as its material existence.

We did not succeed, anyhow not in time; and this was what Thomas Mann in his outcry after the tragic submission of Munich called the "most frightful experience" of German exiles: "the long-drawn-out torture of the growing realization, repudiated up to the last, that we Germans, inside our country and outside it, were not backed by Europe; that Europe, of which we were a part, from which we expected moral support, did not in the least desire the overthrow—several times almost within our grasp—of the National Socialist dictatorship."

There were many German writers—inside Germany and abroad—who experienced "the martyrdom of this slowly dawning realization." A number of them, tortured to death in Nazi concentration camps, like the Nobel Prize-winner Carl von Ossietzky or the poet Erich Muehsam, did not live to see the surrender of Europe to the barbarians. Many others fell silent or were silenced in Germany, but more than two hundred writers managed in one way or another to leave the country.

Two hundred poets, novelists, essayists, in fact the better part of contemporary German literature, went into exile—a phenomenon without precedent in history. (It should be remembered that hundreds of artists, painters, sculptors, musicians, conductors, architects, more than two thousand university professors and scientists—a number of Nobel Prize-winners among them—and thousands of lawyers, physicians, teachers and judges also went into exile, which supports the claim that a large part of the outstanding German intellectuals resisted Nazism.)

It has been argued that these writers were Jews who had *nolens volens* been driven out of Germany, not because they were in opposition to Nazism but simply because they did not fit the racial standards of the Nuremberg laws. The Goebbels apparatus was busy exploiting this thesis. Labeling the exiled writers "Jews" or "bolshevists," Nazi propaganda implied they were not representative either of German literature or of German thought.

That is nonsense. Sigmund Freud, Arnold Zweig, Franz Werfel, Lion Feuchtwanger, Anna Seghers, Alfred Kerr, Ernst Toller, Joseph Roth, Ferdinand Bruckner, Ernst Bloch and many others were not opposed to Nazism merely because it was anti-Semitic; they were opposed to everything it stands for, spiritually, politically, morally. And so were Carl von Ossietzky, Heinrich Mann, Thomas Mann, Ludwig Renn, Erich Maria Remarque, Robert Musil, Leonhard Frank, Fritz von Unruh, Graf Harry Kessler, Oskar Maria Graf, Johannes R. Becher, Bert Brecht, Theodor Plivier, Werner Hegemann, Erich Weinert and about half of the exiled writers who, even according to the paranoiac racial standards of Nazism, are of the "purest Aryan stock."

The book that will enable you truthfully to say

"NOW I UNDERSTAND RUSSIA!"

REVOLUTIONS IN RUSSIA

THEIR LESSONS FOR THE WESTERN WORLD

By G. R. Treviranus

From 1919 to 1932 the author was a member of the German Reichstag and for two years was a member of the Bruening Cabinet, which put him in close touch with the relations of the German Republic to Russia.

Why is Russia's history pock-marked with revolutions like a periodic red rash? What yeast springing out of the life on the soil has been and still is fermenting the peasants to formidable resistance to change and to authority? Why are up-risings endemic in this strange land and the key to its destiny? In this book's answers to these questions is genuine and full understanding of our ally.

1. It gives a vivid account of revolutionary history in Russia in the last 150 years.
2. It supplies an incisive appraisal of the great personages of yesterday and today.
3. It condenses the fascinating story of *modern* Russia.
4. It presents the *key* to Russia's problems of the future.
5. It deflates many popular misconceptions about Bolshevism and Communism in Russia.
6. It tells us why democracies have nothing to fear from Russia *if* their leaders take a firm and honest stand on peace terms.

Illustrated • $3.00

HARPER & BROTHERS, 49 E. 33 St., N. Y. 16

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They all left the "Third Reich" because a German writer with self-respect and with respect for the dignity of literature could not work under the supervision of the Gestapo and the Propaganda Ministry. There were others who, for various reasons, were compelled to await inside Germany the end of the "thousand years" of Hitler's Reich without becoming "*gleichgeschaltet*" (coördinated). They kept their integrity by keeping silent or—and these are exceptional cases—by expressing their opposition to Nazi doctrines and Nazi deeds as well as they could in a disguised manner. The poet and novelist Erich Kaestner tried to do so, and so did the conservative, very successful novelist Ernst Wiechert. They did not go far; their books were suppressed and they were forbidden to publish anything at all. Wiechert was arrested and Kaestner is said to have died (or committed suicide) in 1940 or 1941. A little more successful was the nationalist writer Ernst Jünger, who, protected by his fame as an outstanding hero of World War I, dared to publish a cleverly disguised anti-Nazi book.

We are not supposed to mention the names of writers still living in Germany. But I am glad to have the opportunity of saying that there are many—and very good writers among them—who live and write only in the hope of liberation from the nightmare. Before the outbreak of the war, I received direct and indirect messages from members of this fraternity of the "inner exile" who, since March, 1933, have lived, intellectually, in catacombs. One day they will be the reporters of the experiences of anti-Nazis in Germany before and during the war.

With what remained, Goebbels tried to organize "Nazi literature." He failed miserably. In his mania for the colossal, he herded 30,000 writers—men and women—into a so-called *Reichsverband der Schriftsteller* (writers' association). But, as Heinrich Mann has said: "A writer cannot be coördinated. If he loses his inner integrity, he excludes himself from his profession. . . . Literature exists only where the spirit is powerful but not where it abdicates and bows before the power of anti-spirit."

Exiled German writers also created a professional organization, the "League of German Writers in Exile," which was joined by almost all of the writers who had escaped from the Third Reich. The outcome of competition between the "coördinated writers" and this group for literary recognition throughout the world is one of the rare triumphs of the spirit. In spite of the many millions which Goebbels' agents like Herr Abetz generously spent on propagandizing and promoting Nazi literature abroad, the 200 writers in exile won out against the 30,000 coordinated pens. In the year 1937, for example, 79 books of the 30,000 members of Goebbels' Reichsverband were published abroad against 85 books of the 200 writers united in the League.

But the German writers in exile paid a high price for this victory of their literary integrity and their talent in the life-and-death struggle against Nazism and its allies all over the world. Their part was blood, sweat and tears at a time when the "realists" did business with Hitler and the misguided masses cheered the "peace" of Munich in the streets of Paris and London. The majority of them went through concentration camps, tortures, hunger and despair. Some of them—Kurt Tucholski, Ernst Toller, Walter Hasenclever, Carl Einstein, Stefan Zweig, Walter Benjamin—ended their lives by suicide. Others were killed in Germany by the Nazis, and a number were delivered to the Nazis by the Vichy fascists and shot on the spot, like our unforgettable friend, Rudolf Leonhard, president of the League of German Writers in Exile.

But in spite of all the sufferings we went through, we have always known that we have chosen the better part. We preserved our integrity as writers and human beings. We carried the flame through the night, and those of us who lived through the years of madness will see the dawn of a new morning and deliver their message to coming generations.

Nobody understood our sufferings, our fight, our faith and our hopes better than our great and venerable friend Romain Rolland, who in the end shared the fate of so many anti-Nazi fighters: to be physically crushed by the barbarians. He once introduced a small volume of essays of mine with words which have remained our watchword during all these years:

> Yes, I am with you—the representatives of the suppressed, exiled but invincible better Germany which suffers but fights. The Germany we respect and love is in your camp. . . . Keep faith! The future will remember and honor your example. . . .

It is heartening to remember these words once more on the occasion of this May 10, the last which will see the barbarians in power.

ALFRED KANTOROWICZ

A Reader's List

THE ORGANIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE TRANSITION FROM WAR TO PEACE (International Labor Organization, Montreal, free). The ILO is now holding its twenty-sixth conference on social and economic policy. Its agenda consists of the future status of the organization, postwar social policy, the organization of employment in the transition from war to peace, and social security. This brochure presents the report on employment and is being used as a basis for discussion by the delegates now convened in Philadelphia. The problems of demobilization, reconversion, vocational training and retraining, absorption of disabled workers and the utilization of public works as a weapon against unemployment are discussed with the characteristic sharp vision of the ILO. The program exhibits the kind of constructive thinking so desperately needed by a world in upset. Let us hope that the conference will result in really practicable measures for mitigating the industrial ills that afflict us.

PLANNING NO. 220: WAGES AND THE COST OF LIVING INDEX (Political and Economic Planning. Available through The New Republic, 25 cents.) The recent dispute between the CIO and the Bureau of Labor Statistics concerning cost-of-living indices and the Little Steel formula makes this broadsheet especially pertinent for Americans. PEP discusses here British experience in the use of wage formulas for stabilization purposes. In practice the formulas were nothing more than sliding scales adapted to changes in living costs. Unfortunately, the resulting wage adjustments seldom corresponded to changes in the cost of living. PEP'S conclusion is based on a brief, yet thoroughly documented, study of wage adjustments in six representative British industries. The editors point to Swedish policy for a realistic approach to the problem of wages in both war and peace. In any event, the editors remark,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we should avoid pegging *real* wages at a time when labor's productivity is increasing. The broadsheet concludes with an interesting note on Australia's plans for demobilization. At a time when our own ideas on postwar transition are so befogged, it is good to learn that "the Australians have seen fit to do so much in advance of the end of the war."

GAUGING PUBLIC OPINION, by Hadley Cantril (Princeton, $3.75). Within the past decade the field of public-opinion research has been transformed from an academic hobby and commercial toy to a scientific discipline in good standing. The research presented in this book deals almost entirely with the study of public opinion through some form of polling mechanism. The author discusses the problems encountered in every phase of the polling operation. He considers some of the dilemmas confronting the investigator who sets about the task of posing issues and asking questions, summarizes studies in connection with interviewing, and analyzes sampling problems. How is a sample chosen? How does the "representative sample" of the polls compare with the true population? What is the reliability of small samples? Then the author indicates ways in which polling data may be treated to discover something of opinion determinants. Finally, a single complete study of public opinion is reported, tracing a survey on a complex topic—civilian morale—through its various stages.

MONOPOLY AND CARTEL PRACTICES: VITAMIN D, Part 6 of the Hearings before the Senate Kilgore Committee (Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee). (Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 30 cents.) Authoritative testimony by the Department of Justice on general cartel practices (including the Dusseldorf meeting of British and German carteleers in 1939) and the case history of monopoly and cartel practices in Vitamin D, the sunshine vitamin. A large part of the 248-page volume consists of exhibits proving the Department of Justice charges against the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, commercial exploiters of Vitamin D. An imperative for those alert to the cartel menace.

A LITTLE ANTHOLOGY OF CANADIAN POETS, edited by Ralph Gustafson (New Directions, $1). This little anthology contains two dozen poems, by fifteen poets, including two poems by the editor himself. The names of A. M. Klein, E. J. Pratt, A. J. M. Smith, F. R. Scott, etc., are gradually becoming a little more familiar to American readers: the general level of the verse in this collection is about that of the average number of Poetry: A Magazine of Verse. For the reader who wants primarily information about Canadian poets and their work, the Penguin Books anthology, also edited by Mr. Gustafson, is a better buy; but for a book to keep on the shelves, pleasant if not too exciting, this anthology is attractively made and reasonably priced.

TURKEY, KEY TO THE EAST, by Chester M. Tobin (Putnam's, $2). Like most writers who have long lived in the country whose story they tell, the author of this little primer is enamored of his subject. The book is an unabashed apologia for the nationalist Turkey of Kemal Ataturk and Ismet Inonu. It is true, however, that modern Turkey has an excellent record of streamlining her institutions. In the exclusively Turkish context with which the book deals, the work of Ataturk and Inonu is eminently progressive, even though achieved by dictatorial methods. But the only important question that should be asked, "Is there or has there been a democratic alternative to Turkey's one-party system?," is not answered. The claim that the

In the Enlarged Spring Number of

Partisan Review

T. S. ELIOT
- Toward a Definition of Culture

SIDNEY HOOK
- God, Geometry and the Good Society. A reply to Mark Van Doren's "Liberal Education"

HAROLD ROSENBERG
- Fascism and Bohemia

GEORGE ORWELL
- London Letter

MARY McCARTHY
- Graham Greene and the Intellectuals

OTHER FEATURES
- Niccolo Tucci: Where Anarchy Begins (a story)
- James Agee: The Pseudo-Folk
- James Johnson Sweeney: Piet Mondrian
- Clement Greenberg: Malaquais' "War Diary."
- James Burnham: Adler's War and Peace

VARIETY
- A new department of comment and controversy

Poetry - Fiction - Theatre

Coming this Summer

ARTHUR KOESTLER
- The Intelligentsia

A SYMPOSIUM
- On the issues raised by T. S. Eliot's "Toward a Definition of Culture"

ANNOUNCEMENT
- PARTISAN REVIEW in collaboration with DIAL PRESS announces a novelette contest. Prizes: $500, $250 and $100. Details in the Spring issue.

SPECIAL introductory offer: FIVE issues instead of the usual FOUR for only $2, beginning with the current issue.

$3 FOR TWO YEARS

PARTISAN REVIEW,
45 Astor Place, New York 3, New York.

Enclosed please find $2 for one year, or $3 for two years of PARTISAN REVIEW, with one free issue. (Canada, $2.15; Foreign, $2.30.) Begin with.....issue.

Name.....

Address.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regime is "republican, populist, etatist, laique and revolutionist," as promulgated in the amended constitution of 1937, does not make it democratic. On the whole, however, this is a useful introduction to modern Turkey.

Crime and Punishment

THE CASE OF THE DOWAGER'S ETCHINGS, by Rufus King (Crime Club, $2). Mr. King's unfailing skill in combining interesting plots with good characterization makes you wish he'd choose a subject that would test his mettle. But meanwhile let's be grateful for small favors. His new one concerns what happens when Mrs. Chatterton Giles decides to help the war effort by renting out rooms in her mansion (at $5 a week) to defense workers. The murder that follows involves the entire household, plus Lieutenant Kent Giles, her grandson, just arrived on leave. A perfectly okay job, but we're hoping that in his next book Mr. King will really extend himself.

SAID THE SPIDER TO THE FLY, by Richard Shattuck (Simon and Schuster, $2). This is a completely screwy but rather charming tale by the author of "The Snark Was a Boojum." Who killed the beautiful but uncomfortable (she prided herself on always telling the truth) Jane Fry, granddaughter of Mormons and possessed of an excessively numerous collection of relatives who had no reason to love her? The hero is a lamb, the relatives are divertingly eccentric and the complications are amusing. Recommended for the silly season.

NO LITTLE ENEMY, by Oliver Weld Bayer (Crime Club, $2). When Tom Bonbright, America's top political cartoonist, is persuaded to join one of the Treasury's bond-selling tours, a lot of unpleasant things begin to happen. The unraveling of the chain of ugly incidents leads to the exposure of a clever fascist plot. Good characters and pleasant writing make this a superior story of intrigue on the home front.

E. H.

A Correction

In an editorial in The New Republic of May 1 we described Representative Daniel Reed, of New York State, as a Democrat. Representative Reed is a Republican.

Contributors

Sir Ronald Davison is a well known British writer and lecturer on unemployment and social questions whose books include "The Unemployed: Old Policies and New" and "British Unemployment Policy." He has lectured extensively in the United States and Canada and has played an important part in the work of the British organization, PEP (Political and Economic Planning).

Ernest J. Simmons is chairman of the Department of Slavic Languages at Cornell University and director of Cornell's Intensive Study of Contemporary Russian Civilization program. He is the author of "Pushkin," "Dostoevsky: The Making of a Novelist" and "Outline of Modern Russian Literature."

Elizabeth McCausland, a member of the Sarah Lawrence College faculty and a Guggenheim fellow, is working on a study of the status of the artist in America. She writes a weekly column of art criticism and comment in The Springfield (Mass.) Republican and has contributed to Art News, Art Digest, The Nation and other periodicals. Miss McCausland did the first art study undertaken by the State of New York, which is soon to be published by the New York State Museum, and wrote the introductory essay to the portfolio of Käthe Kollwitz's prints.

W. H. Auden, English poet and playwright, is now teaching at Swarthmore.

Alfred Kantorowicz was the founder and director of the "Library of the Burned Books" described in his essay. He is the managing secretary of the League of German Writers in Exile.

GREEN MANSIONS

OPENS MAY 26
DECORATION DAY

Diversified program for a splendid vacation—for a day, week or season. Golf course on premises.

Make Reservations Now!

LENA BARISH-SAM GARLEN
Directors

N. Y. Office: 11 W. 42nd St.
Tel: Br. 9-1738
Write for booklet

In the Adirondacks
WARRENSBURG, New York

LANGUAGES

PHONOGRAPH RECORD COURSES. All Makes. Booklet R. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st St., New York City 17, N. Y.

★ ★ ★ ★

RATES:

Copy received by Friday will make issue published following Thursday.

Resort Rates
One Inch:
1 insertion • $5.00
6 insertions $4.00 an insertion
13 insertions $3.25 an insertion

Classified Rates
One line of 6 point type (6 words) 50c; one line of 5 point type (7 words) 45c. Minimum, three lines

The New
REPUBLIC
40 East 49th Street
New York 17, N. Y.

★ ★ ★ ★

NEW BIRTH CONTROL

You want to know . . . and should know everything about birth control. Nature offers a dependable, healthful method of controlling conception as recently proven in amazing clinical tests. You owe it to yourself to read about "The Biological Method of Birth Control" by Dr. Francis W. Baxter, consulting psychologist, which explains in detail and includes method of determination of periods of sterility and fertility. Leading ecclesiastical and medical authorities endorse it. Stop using harmful, unreliable and costly contraceptives. In the interest of humanity every thinking man and woman should read this startling information. Order copy of "The Biological Method of Birth Control" now. As special limited offer, send only $2.00 to

DR. FRANCIS W. BAXTER
Editor, Journal of Individual Psychoanalysis
One Sixteen E. 11th Street New York 3, N. Y.
If Over Twenty-one, Send at Once
Copyright, 1944, by Dr. Francis W. Baxter

THE THEATRE GUILD presents (in association with Jack H. Skirball)
JACOBOWSKY and the COLONEL
The FRANZ WERFEL - S. N. BEHRMAN COMEDY — Staged by ELIA KAZAN
LOUIS CALHERN—ANNABELLA—OSCAR KARLWEIS
J. EDWARD BROMBERG
MARTIN BECK THEATRE — 45th St., West of 8th Avenue
Evgs. at 8:30. Mats. Thurs. & Sat. 2:30

MICHAEL TODD presents
BOBBY CLARK in
MEXICAN HAYRIDE
by HERBERT & DOROTHY FIELDS • Staged by HASSARD SHORT
SONGS BY COLE PORTER
WINTER GARDEN, B'way & 50th St. Mats. Wed. & Sat.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED